

The Review of English Studies

VOL. IX.—No. 33.

JANUARY, 1933.

MSS. BODLEY 340 AND 342: ÆLFRIC'S CATHOLIC HOMILIES¹

BY KENNETH SISAM

LATER ADDITIONS

MANY phases of Old English studies might be illustrated from the two Bodley manuscripts, for the old language and favourite sermons died hard. The last mediæval reader who marked these volumes could do little more than add Latin glosses to familiar Gospel texts. Then from the early thirteenth to the sixteenth century they were preserved by the blessed inertia of ecclesiastical libraries, until the revival of antiquarian studies, and their application to religious controversy, again brought readers to the old sermon books. But I shall limit attention to two kinds of later additions.

VI

The first is a group of accents, associated with marks of word-division and punctuation. Some are in ink, some in a coarse brown pencil which occasionally leaves no more than a scratch; and both kinds often suffer later erasure. The accents in ink vary in appearance as though they belonged to different strata.² Those

¹ Continued from *R.E.S.* viii, 51-68, January, 1932.

² All the usages noted below for the pencil occur also in the ink markings. Many of these may come from the same hand as the pencil, if it be allowed that the use of a pen would result in forms different from those produced by a hard point.

in pencil are easier to describe briefly, because they seem to come from one hand. As they occur in the sermons added to MS. 342 by later scribes, they are presumably not earlier than 1050. The form of certain marginal notes in similar pencil, taken in conjunction with places where the pencil is crossed by later corrections, suggests that they were made round about the end of the eleventh century.

Some sermons and passages are densely marked, others lightly, others not at all; and an examination of these last in favourable places¹ reveals the marker's practical purpose. The unmarked passages, which are often secluded by a pencil line in the margin, are evidently the "cuts" made by a person who was preparing the sermon for delivery. The marks, then, were intended to guide him in reading aloud, and are thus free from many of the doubts that embarrass the study of accents in Old English manuscripts. But the consistency of a grammarian is not to be expected in markings made with such a purpose, and conclusions can be more safely drawn from their presence than from their absence.

- (i) The commonest accent is the acute, which is sometimes doubled in a way that suggests careless or hasty marking rather than a considered distinction. It is applied to the vowels of stressed syllables: (a) most frequently to a vowel certainly or probably long: e.g. *fótum*, *hálan*, *éac*, *wórd*, *ýldinge*; (b) commonly to a short vowel in a heavy syllable: e.g. *stíncende*, *cwéartern*, *búrgum*; (c) commonly to a short vowel in a stressed prefix: e.g. *únasecgendlice*; (d) occasionally to a short vowel in a stressed open syllable: e.g. *wíununge* (MS. 340, f. 10a); *sámod* (f. 20b).
- (ii) (a) Stressed short vowels in closed syllables are often indicated by a curl above, which is a variant of the short sign: ² e.g. *Gôd* (so distinguished from *gód* "good"),

¹ E.g. MS. 340, ff. 30-32. In other places the process is not so clear, either because the cuts were decided upon after some markings had been made, or because the text was worked over for more than one occasion. The nature of the recension is of interest, for we know all too little of the habits of English preachers at this time. The sermon for "the Second Sunday after Epiphany and for general occasions" (Thorpe i, p. 54) has had unusually heavy correction.

² In other O.E. MSS. the short sign is like a *c* written above the vowel: this modification in the position of the brevis \sim avoids confusion with the marks of abbreviation usual in Latin MSS. of the time. In the Bodley MSS. the short sign is a curl open on the left-hand side: this variant of the brevis would be inconvenient in Latin, where a similar mark indicates the contraction *-us*; but it serves well enough in the vernacular.

gōdspelle, gōdcundnyse, gecyð, lim, anim, cān(n), mān(n) and mānnum, forhwān, ongān, muntum, getrymman, gæmnie, fūlne, pālm, cwēlmbærum, þwȳr, onbrȳrd, gefȳrn, awūrpon, geānbidode, wānspēdigum. A short sign was first noticed in Old English by Napier, who cited the eleventh century MSS. Cleopatra B XIII and Tiberius A III.¹ It occurs also in MS. C.C.C.C. 190,² and a systematic search would add to the list.

- (b) Sometimes an angular sign like the circumflex is used with the same purpose, e.g. in *hūlcum*, *añdgyt*, *genām*, *stēmn*, *þrȳm*, *gōdcundan*, *gesēt*, *fȳr* (compar. of *feorr*), *pūs*. Occasionally it spans the space between the word to which it belongs and the next; and in *manncynn* (MS. 340, f. 30a) where it should appear over both syllables, it is doubled over the first. This angular sign has not been noticed elsewhere, and is the more curious because the circumflex is traditionally a mark of vowel length. But in the original script (late tenth century) of Salisbury Cathedral MS. 150 it is used both in words like *timēbo* and in words like *dūx*, *nīx*, where the vowel is short but the syllable is long because it is closed by two consonants. This may be the starting point of the usage here.

- (iii) In other manuscripts in which a short sign has been noted, the curl is applied indifferently to short vowels in open and closed syllables. Here the former are distinguished by a new mark—a very long macron which is usually extended over the following consonant and vowel:³ e.g. in *godes*, *boðum*, *brudon*, *gelaðode*, *waracu*, *streca*, *cuma*, *nama*, *wanian*, *tosloþen*, *beran*, *warum* (dat. pl. "wares"), *hryre*, *hwate*, *protan*, *plegan*, *ege*, *onsigon*, *geflogen*, *clawum*, *cneowu*.

Now grammatical devices in English of this period generally reflect the revived teaching of Latin, since Latin, not English, was studied grammatically. And it is at least curious to find that,

¹ *The Academy*, October 1889, p. 221.

² See B. Fehr, *Die Hirtenbriefe Aelfrics* 1914, p. xviii, and for examples, pp. 9, 15, 25.

³ Once (MS. 342, f. 120b) *gegrīpan* (pa.t.subj.pl.) has been corrected to *gegrīpan*.

quite apart from their importance in metre, the Latin short vowels in open syllables had been recently the subject of controversy. Ælfric in the *Preface* to his *Grammar* speaks of the many who pronounce *pater, malus*, etc., in prose after what he calls the "Welsh manner" (*Brittonice*), i.e. with a short vowel, and defends the lengthened pronunciation, which had become established in late Vulgar Latin, by arguing that to address the Heavenly Father with a short vowel in *Pater* is to subject God to the rules of grammar. Evidently the school of Æthelwold was on its defence in this matter, and fell back on an old dispensing argument for want of grammatical authority. Such a dispute might lead to the practice of distinguishing the short vowels of open syllables in Latin, whence it might be transferred to English.¹

But, however that may be, here, a century before the *Ormulum*, is the distinction between short vowels in open and in closed syllables which lies at the root of the long controversy about Orm's system of spelling. Orm doubles a consonant after a short vowel, *except* when the vowel is in an open syllable: thus *mann*: gen. *manness*; *Godd*: gen. *Gödess*; *namm* "he took": but *nāme* "name." According to one view, he doubled the consonant to show that the preceding vowel was short. According to a view which seems to be more favoured by recent writers,² his primary

¹ If this use of the long macron had its origin in the teaching of Latin, it may have been suggested by the metrical equation: two shorts = one long.

² There are three main views—I mention only their earliest or principal exponents:

- (i) That Orm wished to mark the quantity of vowels (A. J. Ellis, *On Early English Pronunciation*, 1869, pp. 55, 486; H. Sweet, *History of English Sounds*, 1874, p. 48 (508); second edition 1888, §§ 616-617; L. Morsbach, *Mittelenglische Grammatik*, 1896, pp. 31 ff.).
- (ii) That he wished to mark the quantity of consonants (M. Trautmann, *Anglia* VII (1884), Anz. pp. 94 ff. and 208 ff.; *Anglia* XVIII (1896), p. 371 ff.).
- (iii) That observation of the varying length of consonants first led Orm to adopt his system, though in the result it came to indicate the quantity of vowels (E. Björkman, *Anglia* XXXVII (1913), pp. 351 ff., who gives a useful history of earlier work; K. Luick, *Historische Grammatik*, 1914, p. 87 f.; R. Jordan, *Handbuch der Mittelenglischen Grammatik*, 1925, p. 37).

The symmetrical evolution of opinion—two opposed views followed by a compromise—is noticeable. There are elements of chance in the fortunes of theories, and it is worth remarking that when Sweet first published his view in 1874, he left the single consonant in words like *nāme* as "a formidable difficulty" unsolved. In his second edition of 1888 he gave a competent explanation. But in the meantime the active and influential school of Trautmann had become committed to consonant-quantity as the solution. It is a question whether this doctrine would have gained so strong a hold if Sweet had been able to state the case in 1874 as he did in 1888.

purpose was to show that the consonant was long; and the exceptional treatment of *nāme*, etc., is in the forefront of their evidence.

The arguments from phonology are fine-drawn, because in English a short stressed vowel is usually associated with a long following consonant in the same syllable. But the tradition behind Orm has not, I believe, been discussed. Our Bodley MSS., almost as regularly as far as the markings go, have the same distinction of short vowels in open and closed syllables: *mān(n)*: *mānnes*; *Gōd*: *Gōdes*; *nām* (pa.t.sg. of *nīman*): *nāma*.¹ Yet I have detected no signs of interest in consonant length. If that were in question, the marker would not help himself by such markings as *þæt hi wære wæron* "that they should be wary" (MS. 340, f. 61a), because in both words the medial consonant is the initial sound of the second syllable.² Indeed, it is hard to see how an Englishman reading his own language aloud could attach practical importance to marking the niceties of consonant length; or why his mind should be directed to it at all as a matter of theory or tradition. Then, and long afterwards, Latin grammar was the only linguistic discipline; and Latin grammar meant the more practical parts of a few standard text-books. If unpractical elements appear, it is because they have the authority of Donatus, Priscian or Isidore. And though these grammarians deal with the length of vowels and syllables, and were eagerly read and developed because the subjects were necessary for the writing of Latin verse, they and their mediæval successors seem to be indifferent to the length of consonants.³ They were either unconscious of subtle variations (as most of us still are unless our interest has been awakened by modern phonetic theory), or else they thought discussion of them unprofitable.

Orm, too, must have been steeped in the current teaching of

¹ There is a difference in the treatment of short diphthongs or virtual diphthongs. The marker of the Bodley MSS. has *clawum*, *cneowu*, so grouping these words with others in which a short vowel stands in an open syllable. Orm writes *clawtweess*, *cneowtweess*, and divides at the line-end *claw-tweess*, etc., exactly as if he were dealing with a short vowel in a closed syllable.

² It might be thought that the mark indicates an abnormal absence of syllable-division, such as is found in similar forms in modern German: that instead of *nā-ma*, etc., the pronunciation was *nāma*. But the practice of scribes and the later lengthening of short vowels in open syllables confirm the normal division *nā-ma*.

³ What is in question is not the patent difference between a single consonant as in *many* and a true double consonant as in *pen-nib*. Orm is supposed to have observed and recorded such differences of length as that between *d* in *God* and *d* in *goad*, *t* in *pit* and *t* in *feet*.

Latin. His sermons are translated from old-fashioned sources; he gives his title a flavour of modesty and Latinity by clapping *-ulum* on to his own name;¹ he abandons native metres for a Latin type without rhyme or alliteration. So he might be expected to look at English from the standpoint of Latin grammar, and from that standpoint the study and marking of consonant length would be an original exercise in phonetics. It is not very likely that an author who is otherwise pedantically attached to tradition should strike out this new line, without any explanation, in a work which he expected to have some currency.

Let us then see what difficulties stand in the way of assuming that he kept to the path of tradition with an eye on the habits of writers and readers of his own time, and that he was particularly interested in the quantity of vowels and syllables.

(i) To distinguish long vowels the Latin grammarians recommended the macron; but except in formal scansion it had been made impracticable in Christian times by the spread of the similar mark of abbreviation—a spread which was suddenly accelerated in the twelfth century. The acute accent was also used in special cases;² but it had so many values in Old English writings that its failure as a distinctive mark of length was inevitable; and still another complication was added in the twelfth century when, from forms like *abt̃t̃*, it began to spread to *i* in all positions. The doubling of the long vowel was not usual or elegant in Latin orthography; it was not very common in late Old English; and it had become associated with a disyllabic pronunciation in words like *abt̃t̃*. Thus, there was no clear and familiar way of marking the long vowels, and Orm generally leaves them unmarked.

(ii) The short mark of the grammarians was not a convenient way of distinguishing the very numerous short vowels in closed syllables, e.g. *Gōd, mǎn(n)*: it was rare in Latin and English texts; it was easily confused with abbreviation marks; and by tradition it belonged equally to the

¹ According to H. Bradley, *Collected Papers* (1928), p. 219, *Ormulum* was "probably an imitation of *Speculum*, a common mediæval name for books of devotion or religious edification." But though it is known earlier, *Speculum* as a title seems to have become popular after Orm's day.

² E.g. to distinguish *pōpulus* "poplar" from *populus* "people."

short vowels in open syllables. But in Latin a double consonant usually follows a short vowel, and in late Old English every doubled consonant followed a short vowel and closed the syllable. This association of short vowel and doubled consonant in the minds of Englishmen is early, for Byrhtferð, writing in 1011, gives as an example of barbarism *pu sôt*, where one should say *pu sott*.¹ Here, ready to Orm's hand, was an unmistakable method of indicating the short vowels in closed syllables, which are the great majority in English. It is the most regular feature of his spelling, and the only one he mentions in his *Preface*.

- (iii) There remain the short vowels in open syllables, such as *ndme*, OE. *ndma* "name." Orm, like the marker of our Bodley MSS., may have aimed at distinguishing them from the short vowels in closed syllables. But even if he had no such purpose, he could not double the consonant in this case without getting into difficulties: for *namme* would inevitably suggest the pronunciation *nam-me*, with a true double consonant; and such words as *süne* "son," *bēde* "prayer," would assume the forms of *sunne* "sun" and *bedde* (dative) "bed."² To his contemporaries the double consonant between vowels had a significance which it has lost in modern English; and sensitiveness on such a point would be increased by the training in division of syllables which was then usual:³ Orm himself would have to consider how he would divide *namme* at the end of a line of his manuscript, and would find *namm/e*, *na/mme* and *nam/me* all intolerable. Yet if he left the short vowels in open syllables unmarked, they might be confused with the long vowels; and the difference was sometimes of practical importance in the *Ormulum*, because a word of the type *ndme* could not fill the last foot in the verse. I should not care to assert that he explored and was oppressed by

¹ Ed. S. J. Crawford, E.E.T.S. 1929, p. 96.

² The point was first made by Sweet, *History of English Sounds*, 2nd ed. 1888, §§ 616-617. I differ from this classic account only in the explanation of Orm's purpose.

³ Scribes sometimes wrote in syllables, e.g. Cotton MS. Vespasian D XX (tenth century), f. 18a, "*am bu las ti pe di bus u bi li ci tum non fu it*."

all these difficulties. A phonetician bent on marking the quantity of these vowels would find an easy solution in the use of a special diacritic such as that found in the Bodley MSS. In fact Orm writes words of this kind with a single consonant, sometimes adding a short sign, e.g. *nāme*, and sometimes not. As a system designed to mark the length of vowels his spelling breaks down.

Must we, then, conclude that it was a system designed to mark the length of consonants? I think not: for there is the possibility, even the likelihood, that Orm's interests were not those of a phonetician at all, and that the end he had in view required neither consistency nor completeness of notation. A phonetic system should represent every sound precisely and uniformly, taking nothing for granted except the reader's willingness and ability to interpret the system. But a working orthography for a special purpose may be produced on a different principle. Its deviser may well consider who will read it, and how, and for what purpose; what knowledge and habits these readers may be assumed to have, and what difficulties they may be expected to feel. Its success will depend on the discreet selection of points at which special help is given, whereas a phonetic notation succeeds by the even fulness of its record.

Clearly, in a working orthography designed for English readers there was no need to distinguish all short vowels in open syllables from long vowels. Uncertainty was likely only when they occurred in words of similar form, and more particularly in contexts that were not plain at the first glance. Orm meets this special case very often by marking the short vowel with the short sign, or the long vowel with the acute, or by using both: thus *bigriþenn* p.p.: *bigriþenn* infin.; *writenn* p.p.: *writenn* infin.; *hātenn* "to hate": *hātenn* "called"; *hēre* "of them": *hēre* "here"; *hēte* "hate": *hāte* "heat"; *lāte* "late": *lāte* "appearance"; *rāþe* "quickly": *rāþenn* "advise"; *rōtenn* "rot": *rōte* "root"; *to tākenn* "to take": *to tākenn* "as a token"; *wāke-menn* "watchmen": *wāke* "weak"; *wēre* "man": *wære* "were"; *wīte* "wise man": *wīte* "punishment." Regularity cannot be claimed for these markings, but there is enough to indicate a practical purpose other than the scientific representation of sounds.

Nor is this practical purpose hard to find. It can scarcely be coincidence that Orm's book and the older Bodley MSS. are both

complete¹ courses of sermons for the common people; that Orm was a canon of the Augustinian order, which undertook the care of lay congregations; and that his age saw the revival of popular preaching at widely distant points in Europe. In his *Preface* he says repeatedly that he explained the Gospel in English because he wished that all English folk should hear it, believe it and follow it in deed, and so win salvation for their souls. This was possible only if his book were read to them by preachers, and the orthographical devices are—as in the Bodley MSS.—intended to help preachers reading aloud to their congregations.

One can imagine the discussions Orm had with his brother Walter, a fellow-canon, who encouraged him to write the *Ormulum*. The signs of change about them were alarming to good churchmen. A ferment of new ideas, many of them worldly in tendency, had unsettled the rank and file of laymen. Might they not still be saved by sound instruction in the gospel, such as Bede gave in Latin? Sermons in English were needed to reach the people; yet there was no foundational course in English now that Ælfric's language, despite patching and modernising, was out of date. To supply the want would be a great work for religion. Verse should be the medium, because the people preferred rhythmic forms and remembered them better. But the apathy and ignorance of congregations were partly due to the way preachers mumbled and blundered in reading the sermon; and no wonder when the spelling of the English texts available had become a medley of archaisms, tricks borrowed from French and careless eccentricities. Something ought to be done to help preachers to read the gospel truths to their congregations as they were trained to read Latin—"distincte et aperte atque verbatim sed et syllabatim ac sensatim."²

This I take to be the subordinate but not insignificant part of orthography in Orm's ill-fated design for saving the souls of Englishmen.³ If so, we may put aside many of the phonological

¹ The extant manuscript in Orm's own hand (MS. Junius 1 in the Bodleian) is only the first part of the larger scheme indicated by his *Preface* and table of contents.

² The jargon is Ælfric Bata's in *Early Scholastic Colloquies*, ed. W. H. Stevenson, 1929, p. 68.

³ This practical motive played a large part in the mediæval development of calligraphy and orthography, which took place mainly in books intended for the use of clerics. So Alcuin, one of the great initiators and guiders of reform, enjoins accuracy

Ne vel falsa legat, taceat vel forte repente
Ante pios patres lector in ecclesia.

(Mon. Germ. Poetæ Latini Ævi Carolini I, p. 320.)

subtleties that have been suggested to account for details in his spelling: even if they crossed his mind, they would be neither intelligible nor useful to preachers in the act of reading aloud. To attain his object he was bound to take familiar usage as a basis, and to improve it by devices which were transparent and not puzzling.¹ So he points his text very carefully, and specially marks the division of words, which is often troublesome at first glance to readers of manuscripts. He introduces a rule like the doubling of consonants after short vowels in closed syllables, which puts no strain on the memory or intelligence of readers. Generally he avoids freakish and misleading spellings; and, as we have seen, he tries to help in special difficulties.² It is natural that the reasons why he chose to help in one place and not in another should often escape us, and that his enthusiasm for an ingenious device should lead him to use it more often than was strictly necessary. There are elements of caprice and carelessness in his work which defy rational explanation. But even in these lapses from scientific perfection, he has a kinship with men of his own time and training, among whom it is hard to find a place for Orm the rigorous phonetician.

VII

The scribbles on the blank leaves of old manuscripts are always worth notice, because the broken scraps that were running in the minds of scribes or readers floated to the surface when a new pen had to be tried.

The last flyleaf of MS. Bodley 342 has been cut in half from top to bottom, so that little is left intelligible, except the copy-book verse *Dicite Pyherides non omnia possumus omnes*, often repeated, and

¹ Even where he distinguishes the sounds in *egge*, "edge," and *eggenn*, "to egg on," by using a different form of *g* (Napier, *Academy*, March 15, 1890), his practical sense appears. The distinction of sounds, which was then what it is now, requires no nice observation; the finer distinction of the symbols will help readers who notice it, but those who do not notice it will at least have the customary spelling of the time, since both the symbols are unmistakably "g."

² Some peculiarities of Orm's orthography may be intended to counteract habits which a preacher would derive from his training in the reading of Latin. Thus it is a safe rule that all Latin vowels before a final *t* are short: *at*, *et*, *-it*, *tot*, *ut*, *caput*, etc. Orm's emphatic double and treble accents are almost confined to syllables containing long vowels followed by *t* in the same syllable: *wrāt*, *gāt*, *jēt*, *fēlles* "vessel," *sīt* "pain," *fōt*, *ūt*. The two or three exceptions ending in *d* might be explained in the same way, but are better accounted for by special circumstances. M. Deutschbein collects the materials in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, vol. 126, pp. 49 ff., and vol. 127, pp. 308 ff., and attempts to find a phonological explanation.

the line-ends of a *quid inde* ? poem in five lines, which show variants from the longer version printed in Wright and Halliwell's *Reliquiæ Antiquæ*, I, p. 57.

The last flyleaf of MS. Bodley 340 is headed by the alphabet followed by *In principio* and many half-erased scribbles. One scribe, regardless of grammar, writes *Probatio penne incaustum*. Another begins *Anno millesimo sexageno quoque seno*, placing musical notes over *sexageno*, and then stops short. Another, with a neat pointed hand of the second half of the eleventh century, tumbles out a more curious rag-bag. He begins with formal pen-trials: *Probatio penne si bona sit; Probatio incausti si bonum sit*. Next comes a prayer to the popular Saint Nicholas: *O beate pater Nicolæ, pium dominum Iesum pro impietatibus nostris deposce!* Then

Scribere qui cupiunt sensum Deus augeat illis!

Next he remembers some leonine hexameters whose mangled text proves that he did not understand them:

Cordarum modulos pangamus nobile melos,
singula dulcisonum quo s(int) ¹ discrimina vocum
callemus resono leviter dinoscere plectro,
et [sic] dissimiles melius formare tenores,²
accentusque gravis ne s(it) ³ moderando suavis
aptemus citara ⁴ fides feriendo canora,
nunc leviori modo clangentes nuncque suppremo. Alleluia.

Then *Quid expectamus nunc?* with a wholly unexpected sequel:

Abent omnes volucres nidos inceptos nisi ego et tu ⁵

and below it

Hebban olla vogala nestas hagunnan hinase hi | anda thu.

This is by far the earliest scrap of Netherlandish that has been recorded in England, and I doubt if it can be matched anywhere.⁶ It recalls a whole series of literary contacts with the Low Countries: Dunstan in exile and in power again; Womær, abbot of Ghent, retiring to die at Newminster, Winchester, in 981; ⁷ the unlucky

¹ Letters in brackets are not legible in the MS. For help in emending the text I am indebted to Mr. Stephen Gaselee, Mr. F. J. E. Raby and Dom André Wilmart.

² tenora, MS.

³ sit] MS. ? f. .

⁴ ceteras, MS.

⁵ He begins *Abent omnes* again below, but goes no further.

⁶ Dr. M. Schönfeld, to whom I have communicated the scrap, will examine its interest for Netherlandish philology in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche taal- en letterkunde*, 52 (1933).

⁷ Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, MS. C. under that year.

clerk of Liège, *omnium fœx Christicolarum*, whom Archbishop Æthelgar employed to work with the Newminster copy of Aldhelm's *De Virginitate*; ¹ nearer our date, Athelard of Liège and Utrecht, who was appointed by Harold to instruct the canons in his favourite Abbey of Waltham; ² and, lastly, the *Flandrenses*, who came in the train of the Conqueror. The Latin sentence looks like a fragment from one of the colloquies which were used to teach Latin, and there may well have been a Fleming among the monks of Rochester.

Readers who have been so patient as to follow the rambling course of these articles may wish to be reminded that they were written to commend the irregular study of Old English manuscripts. Many manuscripts would offer less variety of interest than the example chosen. But MSS. Bodley 340 and 342 are not fresh ground: they have been expertly described since Wanley first made them known in 1705; they are easily accessible, and they have been used by competent modern philologists. If they still offer good gleaning, it is because the attention of the scholars who used them was concentrated on other things.

A persistent restriction of curiosity is not altogether surprising. When a new subject is advancing, as Old English studies did after 1870, with everything to be done and none too many workers, more rapid progress can be made if wandering eyes are disciplined: so we put blinkers on young horses. When the subject becomes established academically, teaching tends to follow the lines that have been worked successfully; they become implicit in systematic training, and are fortified by a professional technique. But with limited materials, the law of diminishing returns presses inexorably. The advances which are the real life of a study become smaller, fewer and more hardly won. Some will then say that the subject is worked out. It is more cheerful to believe that certain veins, once rich, are no longer yielding enough, and to look for others to supplement them. The manuscripts, at least, have still plenty to offer.

¹ *Memorials of St. Dunstan* (Rolls Series), ed. W. Stubbs, p. 388.

² *The Foundation of Waltham Abbey*, ed. W. Stubbs, Oxford, 1861, p. 15.

ROBERT POLEY'S MOVEMENTS AS A MESSENGER OF THE COURT, 1588 TO 1601

By EUGÉNIE DE KALB

At the coroner's inquest on the death of Christopher Marlowe, three men were named as the sole witnesses. One of these was the slayer, Ingram Friser. A second, Nicholas Skeres, is now known to have been associated with Friser, on previous occasions, in shady enterprises within the letter of the law. Robert Poley, the third witness, at first view seemingly the least important, has since proved the most interesting to Marlowe researchers. In 1593, there is nothing to connect him with the household of Friser's "master," Thomas Walsingham, at Scadbury; but in the days of the Babington Plot, some years earlier, we find them acquainted, and both engaged in the secret service of Thomas's famous cousin, the Secretary of State, Sir Francis Walsingham. It is to those days that we must turn for their first acquaintance with Marlowe. For it is in 1587 that the letter from the Privy Council to the University of Cambridge declares Marlowe to have been recently engaged, discreetly and ably, upon secret affairs of State.

In 1593 Marlowe was summoned from Scadbury, Thomas Walsingham's house, to report to the Privy Council, and to await their Lordships' questionings. Twelve days later, while he waited, he was slain by a servitor of that house, in the presence of Robert Poley, who was still in government employ, as a messenger.

We can only conjecture what fears or doubts brought Poley in such haste from the Hague that, twelve days after the summons was served upon Marlowe, Poley had reached Deptford Strand, and was in colloquy with Marlowe and those two others. That it was not to deliver his letters, though "in post," is clear, for those letters must have been still on his person that May 30, since they were not delivered at the Court before June 8. That his presence at that scene in Deptford Strand was most irregular is subtly conveyed by his masters, who forestall inquiry with the statement, occurring

nowhere else among the entries of payments to messengers, of his "beinge in her majesties service all of the aforesaid tyme."

An understanding of Poley's movements is now recognised to be of such value towards an elucidation of Marlowe's life, especially of those parts of it converging to his death, that I venture to offer the full tally of entries that yield this information. They are taken from the Declared Accounts of the Lord Treasurer of the Chamber and Master of the Posts. There are two complete sets of these records: the one on vellum in the Pipe Office; the other, a duplicate on paper, in the Audit Office. In them, we may trace Poley's comings and goings as an accredited messenger to and from English ambassadors, state agents, and courts abroad.

In each year's account there appear two lists of payments to messengers. The second list records without specification of services the lump sums paid during the year to each of the regular messengers of the Court. The name of Henry Maunder, the messenger sent to summon Marlowe from Scadbury, appears in this list for over twenty years. The longer list registers the payments disbursed to messengers-extraordinary who were employed less regularly, showing warrant, place and period of employment. These were the men used on more delicate and secret affairs. Some names appear only once. Poley's name recurs twenty-six times, over a space of thirteen years: from December 1588, three months after his liberation from the Tower, to September 1601, when, it seems by a letter in the Hatfield Papers, Cecil, his then master, discarded him.

Apart from the entry (No. 16) that covers the death of Marlowe, the most interesting inferences dependent on this tabulation of Poley's whereabouts are to be drawn from the chronological position and from the lengths of time allotted to Poley's commissions to Scotland and to the King's Court there. Kyd accused Marlowe of being in correspondence with "the K of Scots," and of persuading men to go thither. If there were truth in the accusation, Poley, a confessed double-dealer, was a messenger to Marlowe's hand. For between December 17, 1592, and March 23, 1592-3, we find him (see Nos. 12, 13 and 15) three times in Scotland, and paid at one time to stay two months in that realm, "rydeing in sondrye places." It is hardly unreasonable to wonder if it is without significance that, just thereafter, the network tightened about Raleigh and his group to undo them; and in that business, on

the showing of the Baines letter, Marlowe was to have been deeply implicated.

Though the practical favours received by Lady Walsingham and by her agent Friser, immediately James succeeded to the English throne, may suggest the subject of that daylong conversation of the four, walking soberly in the garden where none could overhear, it is in Poley's life that we can hope best to discover what Marlowe knew that must go no further, and through what ramifications in Marlowe's life that leads us. These entries, I hope, may supply in some sort a framework for a check and guide in moments of that search :

1. To Roberte Poolye gent upon a warrant signed by Mr Secretary Walsingham dated at the Courte xxvij^{mo} December 1588 for bringeing lettres in poste for her majesties affaires from the King of Denmark to the Courte at Richmonde—xv^{li}.
E 351/542, f. 124b

2. To Robte Poley upon a warrant signed by Mr Secretary Walsingham dated at Nonesuche viij^{mo} July 1589 for Carryeing of lettres in poste for her Majesties affaires to seuerall places in Holland and retourninge with like lettres to the Courte againe—xij^{li}.
Ibid. f. 129a

3. To Robte Polie upon a warrant signed by Mr vicechamberlaine dated xxij^o febr 1589 for Carrienge lettres to Barwicke for her Majesties speciall affaires and returninge from there in like poste to the Courte at Greenewich—x^{li}.
Ibid. f. 141b

4. To Robte Polie upon a warrant signed by Mr Vicechamberlaine dated xxij^o Julij 1590 for bringeing lettres in poste concerninge her Majesties speciall Service from fflushing and sondrie other places in the Lowe Countries—x^{li}.
Ibid. f. 144a

5. To Roberte Poolye upon a warraunte signed by Mr vicechamberleyne dated at Richmonde xxij^d Decembrie [*sic*] 1590 for careinge of lettres in poste for her Majesties service from the Courte at Richmonde to Ostend in the Lowe Countryes & retourninge with lettres of lyke service—x^{li}.
Ibid. f. 154b

6. To Robte Poolye upon a warraunte signed by Mr vicechamberleyne dated at the Courte xx^{mo} May 1591 for careinge letters in poste for her Majesties affayres to the town of Barwycke & retourninge with letters of aunswere—x^{li}.
Ibid. f. 156b

7. To Roberte Poolie upon a warrant signed by Mr Vicechamberlaine dated at the Courte xx^{mo} December 1591 for Carryenge letters in poste for her Majesties speciall Service from the Courte at Whitehall to the Towne of Barwicke, for his attendaunce there upon the saide Service by the space of viij dayes and for returninge to the Courte at Whitehall with like lettres in poste the xvij of the same Mooneth—x^{li}.

Ibid. f. 167b

8. To Robte Poolie upon a warrant signed by the Lord Treasurer dated at Whitehall v^{to} Martij 1591 for Carriage of lettres in poste for her Majesties speciall affairs from the Courte at Whitehall primo Martij 1591 to the Towne of Brussels in the Lowe Countries—x^{li}.

E 351/542, f. 169a

9. To Robte Poolye upon a warrant signed by Mr vicechamberlaine dated at the Courte xxij^o Junij 1592 for his Chargs and paynes in Carriage of lettres in poste for her Majesties speciall Service from the Courte at Greenwich the firste of June 1592 to the Towne of Barwicke and his staye there and returninge with like lettres to the Courte at Greenewich the xijth of this Mooneth—x^{li}.

Ibid. f. 170b

10. To Roberte Pooley upon a warrant signed by Mr Vicechamberlaine dated at the Courte at Cicester iij^o Septembre 1592 for his Chargs and paines in Carryenge of letters in post Concerninge her Majesties speciall affaires of greate importaunne from the Courte at Nonesuch to Antwerpe and from thence to diverse and sundrie places in the Lowe Countries, and for his returne from thence with like lettres of Answere to the Courte at Cicester the seconde of September 1592—xxx^{li}.

Ibid. f. 171b

11. To Roberte Pooley upon a warrant signed by Mr Vicechamberlaine dated at the Courte at Oxforde xxv^{to} September 1592 for his Chargs and paines in Carryenge of letters in post concerninge her highnes speciall affaires from the Courte at Smedley Castle to Dover and for his returne with letters of Answere to the Courte at Oxforde the xxiiith of September 1592—vj^{li} xij^o iij^o.

Ibid. f. 171b

12. To Roberte Poolye uppon a warrant signed by Mr vicechamberleyne dated at Hampton Courte xvij^{mo} December 1592 for his chardges & paynes in carryenge of lettres in poste for her heighnes speciall service of greate importance from Hampton Courte into Scotlande to the Courte there, and for his attendaunce in that place and service, and rydeinge in sondrye places within that province by the space of twoe whole monethes, and for his retourne in the like poste with lettres of aunswere to Hampton Courte agayne the xiiijth of December laste—xliij^{li}.

Ibid. f. 180a

13. To Roberte Poolye uppon a warrant signed by Mr vicechamberleyne dated at Hampton Courte vj^{to} January 1592 for his paynes and expences for carryenge of lettres in poste for her highnes speciall service from Hampton Courte into Scotlande to the kinges Courte & for retourninge backe agayne in like poste with lettres of Aunswere vj^{to} January 1592—xvj^{li}.

Ibid. f. 180b

14. To Roberte Poolye uppon a warrant signed by Mr Vicechamberleyne dated at Hampton Courte xij^{mo} february 1592 for carryenge of lettres in poste for her heighnes affaires of speciall ymportaunce from Hampton Courte unto Brussels in the Lowe Countryes—vj^{li}.

Ibid. f. 181a

15. To Robte Poolye uppon a warrant signed by Mr vicechamberleyne dated at the Courte xxij^o Marcij 1592 for his paynes and expences for

Carrying of lettres in poste for her heighnes speciall and secrett afayres of greate importaunce into Scotlande to the kinges Courte there, and for retourninge backe agayne to the Courte at St James xxij^o Marcij 1592 with lettres of aunswere—xxj^{li}. E 351/542, f. 181b

16. To Roberte Poolye upon a warrant signed by Mr vicechamberleyne dated at the Courte xij^{mo} die Junij 1593 for carrynge of lettres in poste for her Majesties speciall and secrete afaires of great ymportaunce from the Courte at Croyden the viijth of Maye 1593 into the Lowe Countreys to the towne of the Hage in Hollande, and for retourninge backe agayne with lettres of aunswere to the Courte at Nonesuche the viijth of June 1593 beinge in her majesties service all the aforesaid tyme—xxx^{li}. *Ibid.* f. 182b

17. To Roberte Poolye upon a warrant signed by Mr vicechamberleyne dated at the Courte xiiij^{to} Julij 1593, for Carryenge of lettres in poste Concerninge her heighnes speciall afaires from the Courte at Nonesuche into ffraunce to the towne of Bruxes to Mr Otwell Smyth her heighnes Agent there, and for his retourne backe agayne with like lettres of aunswere to the Courte at Otelandes—x^{li}. *Ibid.* f. 183a

18. To Robte Pooley gent upon a warrant signed by Mr vicechamberlaine dated xix^o August 1594 for carringe lettres concerninge her Majesties affaires from the Courte at Grenewiche to Brussels in the Lowe Countreys and for his retorne backe withe lettres of answere—xx^{li}. *Ibid.* f. 196b

19. To Robte Pooley upon a warrant signed by Mr vicechamberleyne dated at Whitehall primo Aprilis 1595 for carrying of lettres in poste for her Majesties service to Antwerpe in the Lowe Countries & returning with lettres of Aunswere—xiiij^{li} vj^s viij^d. *Ibid.* f. 207b

20. To Robte Pooley upon a warrant signed by Mr vicechamberleyne dated at Greenwich primo August 1595 for carrying of lettres in poste for her Majesties service to Brussels in the Lowe Countries and returning with lettres of aunswere—xiiij^{li} vj^s viij^d. *Ibid.* f. 209a

21. To Robte Polye upon a warraunte signed by Mr Secretairie Dated at Whitehall vij^{mo} Marcij 1596 for bringeing lettres for her Majesties specyall Service from Mr George Guilpin at the Hage in Hollande and for retourninge with lettres of answere—xx^{li}. E 351/543, f. 13a

22. To Robte Pooley uppon a warraunte signed by Mr. Secretarie dated at Whitehall xix^{mo} Decembris 1598 for bringeing lettres for her Majesties speciall service from the Governor of Bayon in ffraunce and for retourning with lettres of aunswere—xv^{li}. *Ibid.* f. 39b

23. To Robert Pooley uppon a warraunte signed by Mr Secretary dated at the Courte at Greenwich x^{mo} die Junij 1600 for his charges and paynes in bringing letters for her Majesties service from the Hage in Holland sent by Mr Guilpin her highnes Agent with the states of the United Provinces and for retourninge with lettres of aunswere—x^{li}. *Ibid.* f. 58b

24. To Robte Pooley uppon Mr Secretaries warraunte dated at Whitehall xxij^{do} Decembris 1600 for bringeing of lettres for her Majesties service from Sir Johan de Laye in ffraunce—x^{li}. E 351/543, f. 68a

25. To Robte Pooley uppon Mr Secretaries warraunte dated at Grenewich iiij^{to} Augusti 1601 for bringeing of Lettres for her Majesties service from Mr Wynwood at Parys and retournynge with aunswere—xiiij^{li} vj^s viij^d. *Ibid.* f. 70a

26. To Robte Pooley uppon Mr Secretaries warraunte dated at Aldermarston v^{to} Septembris 1601 for carreing of lettres for her Majesties service to Parys and retourninge with aunswere—x^{li}. *Ibid.* f. 70b

THE ORDER AND CHRONOLOGY OF SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS

By J. A. FORT

IN the 104th Sonnet the author states clearly that he wrote that poem just three years after he had met "the Fair Youth" for the first time, their first meeting having taken place in the April of some year; and in the 107th Sonnet he clearly alludes to certain events which had occurred recently. If, then, the order in which Thorpe printed "The Fair Youth sonnets" (Nos. 1 to 126) is in truth substantially the order in which they were originally composed, and the events alluded to in the 107th Sonnet can be identified, it is evident that the period of time within which Shakespeare composed most of his sonnets can be determined with very great precision.

As for the second of these problems, it has, I feel confident, been solved correctly by Dr. G. B. Harrison. In a letter to the Literary Supplement of the *Times* of November 29, 1928, he pointed out that there was in the sixteenth century a general belief that "the climacteric year," *i.e.* the sixty-third year of a person's life, was, since 7 and 9 were considered unlucky numbers, unusually dangerous to human life, and that in the spring of the year 1596 Queen Elizabeth, who was then in her sixty-third year, was in fact so ill that grave fears were entertained and were widely entertained as to her recovery. Dr. Harrison regards the fifth and sixth lines of the sonnet "The mortal moon hath her eclipse endured, And the sad augurs mock their own presage" as an allusion to this illness and subsequent recovery of the queen, while he regards the next two lines "Uncertainties now crown themselves assured" as a reference to Henri IV's successes in France in the year 1596 and to a renewed League of Amity between him and Elizabeth in September of the same year. Since Elizabeth reached the age of sixty-four on September 6, 1596, this sonnet, he argues, must have been written soon after that date; and his theory explains all the phrases in the sonnet so satisfactorily, that it ought, I think, to be accepted unreservedly.

As for the other problem that I have mentioned, though the continuity of the thought in all well-defined groups of sonnets, especially Nos. 1 to 17, 33 to 42, 78 to 87 and 108 to 124, and to some extent even in the whole series of letters to "the Fair Youth" has always made it highly probable that the order in which the first 126 sonnets were originally printed was substantially the order in which they were composed, so much depends on the question whether this is or is not true, that it seemed to me necessary to look for further evidence bearing on the subject, and I have, I think, found new evidence of considerable value.

In the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* of 1884, Dr. Hermann Isaac suggested that, as an author expresses similar thoughts and uses certain favourite phrases more frequently in works composed about the same time than he does in works composed at very different dates, the time when most of Shakespeare's sonnets were written could be determined approximately by counting the number of the similar phrases—or "parallelisms," as he called them himself—that are found in the poet's sonnets on the one hand and, on the other, in his narrative poems and plays. Serious practical difficulties arise in the application of Isaac's principle, for parallelisms are, after all, only pairs of passages, each of which recalls the other to a particular reader, and similar passages differ considerably in reliability and significance; the two members of a parallelism may also be divided by a very short or quite a long interval of time. But in itself Isaac's principle is a sound one, and as, though sometimes a striking thought was echoed only once and in two cases the interval between two very similar expressions was certainly an interval of several years, the parallelisms are, for the most part, simply ideas and phrases which are specially appropriate in love-making or conversations and which therefore re-appear in a succession of plays, most of them are in fact so nearly equal in reliability and significance that they can properly be rated at the value of "one." When, therefore, the parallel passages are gathered into fairly large groups, then, since a group of, say, fifteen plays must contain about as much love-making and conversation as another group of the same size contains, and the length of time separating the two members of each parallelism must be on the average very much the same in the one group as it is in the other, the figures obtained by collecting parallelisms undoubtedly enable us to estimate roughly the affinity of thought in the various works of the poet. Since Isaac published

only examples of his work in the *Jahrbuch*, and since, though Dr. Alden in his edition of Shakespeare's sonnets tabulated certain totals obtained by him and by Mr. Horace Davis, the details of the work of those two scholars are inaccessible, I am obliged to use here the figures that I have obtained from my own examination of Shakespeare's plays and poems.

My purpose being to test Thorpe's order for the sonnets, I first grouped together the parallel passages that I found in the fifteen plays which I believe to be the earliest plays of Shakespeare, and then I grouped those that I found in the fifteen plays which I believe to have been composed next after the first fifteen; I also noted the parallel passages that I found in *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*. Then I divided the sonnets of the first two series into six batches, five of which contain twenty-six sonnets apiece and the other one twenty-two. Finally, I noted how many of the parallel passages in the two groups of plays and in the two narrative poems are connected with each of the batches of sonnets. The results of my work are set out in the following table, the fifteen plays of the first group being the three parts of *Henry VI*, *Comedy of Errors*, *Titus Andronicus*, *Taming of the Shrew*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Richard III*, *King John*, *All's Well*, which I believe to have been in an earlier form Meres's *Love's Labour's Won*, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Richard II*, and *Merchant of Venice*, while the fifteen plays of the second group are the two parts of *Henry IV*, *Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Henry V*, *Much Ado*, *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*, *Julius Cæsar*, *Hamlet*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Othello*, *Measure for Measure*, *Macbeth*, *King Lear* and *Timon of Athens*. Sonnets 127 to 152 are of course contemporaneous with sonnets 33 to 42.

	(a) sts. 1-26	(b) sts. 27-52	(c) sts. 127-152	(d) sts. 53-78	(e) sts. 79-104	(f) sts. 105-126
Number of passages in the fifteen earliest plays which are echoed in the several batches of sonnets ..	54	49	49	26	34	29
Number of passages in the next fifteen plays which are echoed, etc.	30	25	18	12	35	39
Number of passages in <i>Venus and Adonis</i> which are echoed, etc. . .	22	8	4	4	4	2
Number of passages in <i>Lucrece</i> which are echoed, etc.	13	11	6	5	6	2

The figures ¹ that stand in this table opposite the two narrative poems, the composition of which can be dated with considerable accuracy, since the one was published in April 1593 and the other in May 1594, seem to me to show clearly that figures extracted by Isaac's method do really yield the results that he expected from it, while the figures that stand opposite the two groups of plays show quite plainly that those sonnets which are early sonnets according to Thorpe's arrangement are in fact more closely connected with the earlier plays than they are with the later ones, while conversely those sonnets that are late sonnets according to Thorpe's arrangement are less closely connected with the earlier plays than they are with the later ones. I do not see how this result can possibly have come about by accident or even by the most skilful editorship on Thorpe's part; it can, so far as I can see, only be due to the fact that Thorpe really did arrange Shakespeare's sonnets substantially in their true chronological order. No doubt that is surprising, and we can only conjecture how the poems were preserved from the dates when they were composed to the year 1609; but as four of the sonnets, Nos. 129, 138, 144 and 146, which Thorpe then printed, were not letters addressed to any one, while the other 148 were originally sent to three different persons, we have, I think, good reason to believe that the "bringer to life" of these sonnets (compare the use of "beget" in *Cymbeline*, v. iv, 123, and *Pericles*, v. i, 197) obtained his material directly or nearly directly from Shakespeare himself. "On the whole," Sir Edmund Chambers writes, "it does not seem likely . . . that the whole collection can have been kept together by any one but Shakespeare himself" (*William Shakespeare*, Vol. I, p. 562). Thorpe's order for the sonnets is therefore probably Shakespeare's own order for them, and in any case, unless the evidence of the parallel passages in the sonnets is not only untrue but is directly the reverse of the truth, the order in which the poems were originally printed is substantially the order in which they were originally composed.

If, however, the above argument is correct, the period of time

¹ In counting the parallelisms I excluded from my list a few that Isaac accepted in the *Jahrbuch*, while I also counted certain frequently-recurring expressions—"Amen" to express consent appears seven times in *Richard III*—only twice in each play. In the two narrative poems Isaac, according to Dr. Alden, found 87 parallelisms and Davis 124, where I found 89; in the fifteen earliest plays Isaac found 292 parallelisms and Davis 372, where I found only 241; in the second group of fifteen plays Isaac found 151 parallelisms and Davis 146, where I found 159. My argument, therefore, would apparently not have been seriously affected if I could have obtained access to the details of the work of those two scholars.

within which Shakespeare composed most of his sonnets is very clearly defined, for the 104th Sonnet must have been composed in the spring of the year 1596 and the three-year period mentioned in that poem must have run from April 1593 to April (or thereabouts) 1596, while the sonnets of the second series, Nos. 127 to 152, must be contemporaneous with Nos. 33 to 42 of the first series. The 107th Sonnet was composed soon after September 6, 1596, and Nos. 108 to 126 probably within the next year or the next year and a half. It will be noticed and it is satisfactory that this time-scheme holds good, whoever the person was to whom Shakespeare's sonnets were addressed.

At the same time the dates that I have mentioned do have a very definite bearing upon the question of the identity of "the Fair Youth," for the first seventeen sonnets, in which the poet urges his friend to marry and beget a child, were composed at a time when Lord Pembroke was only thirteen or fourteen years of age, but when Lord Southampton was not only known to be under a contract to marry Lady Elizabeth Vernon but was also, as we know from the Dedications to *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*, very closely associated with Shakespeare. Theories which identify "the Fair Youth" with some imaginary person seem to me theories of desperation, and theories which identify him with an unknown counterpart and rival of Lord Southampton seem to me also quite impossible. How can "the Fair Youth" have been any one but the third Earl of Southampton himself?

Perhaps I may add that some of the parallelisms, which I collected, seem to me strongly to suggest that even those sonnets which have been held by some critics to be "un-Shakespearian" are, after all, quite authentic. Thus Shakespeare wrote in 3 *Henry VI*, I, iv, 143 and 144, "Bidst thou me rage? Why now thou hast thy wish. Wouldst have me weep? Why now thou hast thy will"; and in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, IV, ii, 93, "You have your wish; my will is even this," within a year and a half of the time when the author of the 135th Sonnet wrote "Whoever hath her wish, thou hast thy will," while ll. 1534 to 1540 of *Lucrece* show, I fear, beyond any doubt, that Shakespeare may possibly have been the author even of the sorriest of all the sonnets, No. 145. The ninety-fourth line of *Venus and Adonis*, "She bathes in water, yet her fire must burn," also suggests that Nos. 153 and 154 may have been early sonnets of Shakespeare's making. But these are minor matters.

SOME UNPUBLISHED POEMS OF JAMES SHIRLEY

By R. G. HOWARTH.

SEVERAL pieces may be added to the collection which Dyce made for the edition of Shirley's complete works issued in 1833. The late Mr. G. Thorn-Drury reprinted in *A Little Ark*, 1921, from the only known copy, a congratulatory ode on the return of Charles II. Manuscripts yield further pieces. B. M. Additional MS. 33998 contains, among transcripts of accredited poems of Shirley, two which are entirely new and one which is a curious variant. The attribution to "James Shirley" is certainly correct. The first of these poems, "The Goodnight," is the companion piece to the "Good Morrow" (*Poems*, 1646, p. 3), and follows it in the manuscript. The third, entitled "Chlorinda's Garden," is apparently an early version of "The Garden" (*Poems*, p. 69). In Bodleian MS. Ashmole 38, where it occurs on p. 39, this poem is called "Cardias Garden," and presents some differences, which I list below, from the Additional MS. version. It is noticeable that in "The Garden" Chlorinda or Cardia has become a man; but this metamorphosis is not more curious than some changes Shirley made in revising other poems of his for publication.¹

Harleian MS. 6918 has one poem attributed to "I: Shirley," and from internal considerations undoubtedly his. It occurs also, unascrbed, in Ashmole 36. The fact that the poem takes the form of wishes for the New Year, and the date, November 29, 1641, of the latest topical allusion contained in it, show that it was written in December, 1641. Possibly the reference in line 18 is to "the Preaching Cobler How," on whom Robert Heath has an epitaph on p. 51 of the Epigrams published with *Clarastella* in 1650.

Shirley's life at St. Albans during the years 1618-1625 has recently² been documented by Mr. A. C. Baugh. A reflection of this period may be seen in Shirley's lost "Tragedy of Saint Albons,"

¹ Compare Bodleian MS. Rawlinson Poetry 88 with *Poems*, 1646.

² *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xvii, 228-35; *R.E.S.*, vii, 62-66.

entered on the Stationers' Register on February 14, 1639/40. It is thus interesting to find in Ashmole 38, in the one hand, two poems relating to St. Albans, the first attributed to "I S" and both sufficiently in Shirley's worst manner. The only reason for printing the second, which occurs also in Additional MS. 18044, is its proximity to the first. Neither can be regarded as Shirley's without proof. The painted window which forms the subject of the first poem is no longer in existence, and I am informed that possibly it was accidentally broken at the last restoration of the Cathedral (1877 onwards), and then removed. Apparently no trace of "verses wrighten under" it is to be found.

I.

THE GOODNIGHT.

(Additional MS. 33998, fol. 45.)

1. Good night to her, who when she sleepes,
the world in sable Darkenesse keepes ;
obscuring wth y^e veyle of her bright eyes
more radiant Luster then y^e skyes
hide from vs, when blacke Cloudes
Phoebus faire beames enshroudes. [5]
2. Good night to her, who makes y^e Bed
w^{ch} doth enfould her Maydenhead
more sweet then odours & Arabian gums,
then Easterne Spices, or perfumes, [10]
When in her Phœnix Nest
alone she list to rest.
3. India hath no Iems so rare
as in thee most frequent are ;
Nor doth y^e world Contayne such precious sweetes [15]
as thy spottlesse Virgen Sheetes,
w^{ch} amorously entwyne
that purer white of thine.
4. May pleasing slumbers, w^{ch} invite
thy Beautyes to repose, delight [20]
thy senses charmd by silent sleepe ; Goodnight,
thou Magazine of all perfection,
my heart, by Loves Election,
is left to thy protection.

JAMES
SHIRLEY.

II.

TO A YONG LADY WEeping.

(Additional MS. 33998, fol. 46.)

Sweet, dry thy eyes, If it be Love
 that doth this sad passion move ;
 Let not misprision so abuse thee,
 he hath no soule y^t can refuse thee.
 Hath fortune Crossd thee, or hath fate [5]
 pursude thee wth malicious hate ?
 Or have thy nearest dearest frendes
 estrang'd themselves ? whereon dependes
 this griefe of thine ? nature wilbe
 angry and displeasd wth thee, [10]
 Iustly too, if thou permitt
 sorrow so Constantly to sitt
 vpon thy face, & overshadowe
 those Beautyes, w^{ch} when first she made
 It was Concluded she had done [15]
 her Master piece, w^{ch} gazers on
 admiring, say, there is no place
 where Beauty raignes, but in thy face.
 Wrong not then thy selfe & her
 w^{ch} gave it thee, least she Confer [20]
 (instead of Constant favours yielding)
 her wrathfull hate, so that faire Building
 Where Love by Beauty now is Captive led
 shalbe ras'd downe, & quite demolished.

JAMES
SHIRLEY.

III.

CHLORINDA'S GARDEN.

(Additional MS. 33998, fol. 46.)

1. fayne would I have a Plott of ground
 w^{ch} the Sun did never see,
 nor by wanton Lover found,
 that alone my Garden bee.
2. No curious flowers doe I crave, [5]
 to tempt my smelling, or my eye,
 A litle heart's ease let me have
 but to looke on, ere I dye.
3. In y^e Violettes drooping head
 will my Counterfeit appeare, [10]
 A litle Time, but withered ;
 but no Woodbine shall grow there.

4. Weave a pretty roabe of Willow,
on each side lett Blackthorne grow,
rayse a Banke, where for my pillow [15]
Wormwood, Rew, & Poppy strow.
5. No Bird sing here but Philomel,
or the Orphan Turtle groane,
Eyther of these Two can tell [20]
my sad story, by their owne.
6. Here let no man find me out,
or, if chance shall bring one hither,
I'll be secure, when round about
tis moated wth my eyes foule weather.
7. Thus let me sigh my heart away, [25]
at last to one as sad as I
He give my Garden, that he may,
by my example, love & dye.

JAMES
SHIRLEY.

Variant Readings in MS. Ashmole 38, p. 39 : 5. crave] weaue 9-12
follow 20 9. drooping] dropping 13. roabe] Roofe 14. lett] the 17.
Bird] voyce 20. by] in 23. secure, when] sure then 24. tis moated]
to Moote y^t eyes] teares

IV.

A SONGE :

(Harleian MS. 6918, fol. 28.)

Coblers, and Coopers and the rest
Stand by, for I am now posset
with prophesy, or poesy at least :

Could but the Spirit ryme with mee,
pure Robin Wisedomes psalmes should be [5]
noe lesse Apocryphall then the Letany :

To Westminster you neede not come,
the Sonnes of Zeale may stay at home,
and ryme to death both Antichrist and Rome :

The Citty shall grow wise and see, [10]
tis better to obay the three,
then of themselues a fourth Estate to bee :

They'll giue more money, and lesse Cryes,
not aske more heads ; he that defyces
Altars, mee thinkes should loue noe sacrifice : [15]

Nor shall they come and teare their throates
to cry downe Bishops, and their votes
in spirits from the Coblers sermon notes :

But by their owne late losses taught,
Since they the Churches Ship-wrack sought, [20]
thinke all these ship-wracks are not sent for nought :

Nor shall the prentices define
Church lawes, but if they still repine
at Bridewell they may learne new discipline :

Thinke not at Bishops they will stay,
nor at Recusant Lords, when they [25]
durst picke the pocket of my good Lord Say :

Nor shall they putt us still in minde
of Ireland, Ireland when wee finde
them and the Rebells sailing by one winde : [30]

Not knowing which to wish or feare
Either the Irish Rebells heere
or these supposed the best of subiects there :

Burges despairing to Confute
Bishops, since number will not doe't [35]
Shall now submitt, or which is worse dispute :

Burton shall say he had noe wrong,
and thinke his Eares are still too long,
and next shall offer his seditious tongue :

May noe malignant planet raigne, [40]
may none doe wrong and then complaine,
may all be friends and in their witts againe :

May all things with the yeare be new
Except the Church, and but a few [44]
old officers which yet continue true. I: SHIRLEY.

Variant Readings in MS. Ashmole 36, fol. 127 : 3. poesye] Poetry
5. pure] Poore 6. the] omitted 8. the] yo^r 16. their] the 18. in
spirits from] Inspired wth 21. Thinke] See, these] their 26. nor] Or
27. durst] Dare my] y^e 28. shall] neede 29. when] whilst 30. by] wth
31-33 omitted 35. number will not] numbers cannot 38. and thinke]
But thinke 39. next shall offer] neck shall of or 40. raigne] faine 44.
but a] very 45 yet] still

- V. verses wrighten vnder A windowe In the Abby Church
of S^t Alban whearin the Execution of that protomartire
was paynted ; the Heads mans eyes, falling out att the

Martirdome by

I S

(MS. Ashmole 38, p. 174.)

The Image of our frailtie, paynted glass
Shewes whear S^t Albans life and ending was
A knight beheades the Martire, but see soone
His eyes Droppt out, seeing what hee had done
And leaueing thayr owne head, seemd with a tear [5]
To waile the other head lay Mangled there
Because his eyes before noe teares would shed
his eyes themselues like teares fell from his head
O Miracle, that when S^t Alban Dies
The Murderer himselfe, weeps out his eyes [10]
finis

- VI. In verolamium, a forgotten Cittie
some tymes standing neere S^ct Albions

(MS. Ashmole 38, p. 176.)

Stay thy foot that passeth by
Heer is a wounder to discrye
Churches that Interrd the dead
Here them selues are sepulchred
Howses whear men sleep and wakt [5]
Here In Ashes vnder rakt
In a word to Allude
Here is Corne whear once Troy stood
or more fully Home to haue
Hers a Cittie In a graue [10]
Reader wounder thincke y^{tt} then
Cittis thus should dye like men
And y^{tt} wounder thinke y^{tt} none
Manye Cittis thus are gone

finis

Variant Readings in Additional MS. 18044, fol. 72: Title. Of the
old Cittie of verulam nere s^t Albons 2. a] omitted 7. word] word then
11. thincke y^{tt}] thinke itt 12. thus should] should thus 13. And y^{tt}] and yet thinke y^{tt}] thinke itt

THE WILKINSON MSS. AND PERCY'S CHINESE BOOKS

By VINCENT H. OGBURN

THREE articles relating to Bishop Thomas Percy by Mr. L. F. Powell and Miss Alda Milner-Barry¹ have done much to clear away the haze that Percy allowed with apparent willingness to gather round his Chinese works. Still there are obscure spots remaining, some of which may be clarified by light from sources not hitherto used by students of the subject. The present study is concerned with the Wilkinson MSS. and with certain questions on the development of Percy's two Chinese books.

First, we may ask, what were the Wilkinson MSS.? That is, what material did they contain, and in what form was it? In the Preface of *Hau Kiou Chooan*² Percy briefly describes the chief part of the manuscripts, thus:

The History is contained in four thin folio books or volumes of Chinese paper; which after the manner of that country, are doubled in the fore-edge and cut on the back.

Nothing is said here of other papers which might have accompanied the "four thin folio books," but later,³ Percy states that Wilkinson "indulged him with the free use of all the Translator's papers." It is no doubt natural to suppose from the word "all" that Wilkinson possessed a considerable number of Chinese books and manuscripts, a fairly rich store from which Percy gleaned the most interesting parts.

Actually, the stock of Wilkinson manuscripts relating to Chinese subjects appears to have been rather meagre, comprising not a great deal more than the body of the novel. Fortunately a list of the items in these "Wilkinson papers" has been preserved. It came

¹ Alda Milner-Barry, "A Note on the Early Literary Relations of Oliver Goldsmith and Thomas Percy," *Review of English Studies*, ii, 51-61; L. F. Powell, "Hau Kiou Chooan," *ibid.* ii, 446-55; Alda Milner-Barry and L. F. Powell, "A Further Note on Hau Kiou Chooan," *ibid.* iii, 214-18.

² I, x.

³ *Ibid.* xxvii. (This reference was kindly furnished by Mr. Powell.)

to Harvard University, with the materials purchased by Professor Child, from the Sotheby sale of the Percy library in April, 1884. A sheet of note size, folded once, contains on the first page a memorandum of the borrowing and of the return of the books.¹ The first part reads thus :

Feb. 28th, 1758,

Borrow'd of Cap't Wilkinson the following Books, which I hereby promise to restore upon demand.

The History of Shuey Ping Sin, a Chinese Novel in 4 Books MS. stitch'd in blue Paper.

The Argument of a Chinese Play, in 2 loose Sheets of Paper.

Four Chinese Books, with Cutts, 1 of human figures. 3 of Sketches of Landscapes etc.—Stitch'd in blue Chinese Paper.

THOMAS PERCY.

Below, on the same page, is the acknowledgment of the return of the materials :

Bugbrook 23d Dec'er.² Rec'd of the Rev'd. Mr. Percy all the above articles except the last.

J. WILKINSON.

And on the third page is this additional note :

DEAR PERCY :

I am this moment come in From Fox hunting Cold Wet & Miserable. So must excuse my saying more than that I am obliged to You for the Books. We all send Respects Compliments etc. etc. hope it wont be long before we meet. I am

My Dear Friend

Sincerely Yrs.

J. WILKINSON.

The three items named here were used in *Hau Kiou Chooan*. Percy's disposal of them is rather easily followed. "Shuey Ping Sin" of course occupies the central space. (Unfortunately this memorandum offers no clue as to her Portuguese entanglement.) The second article, "The Argument of a Chinese Play," was appended to the novel, in the fourth volume, under the slightly more informing title, "The Argument or story of a Chinese play, acted at Canton, in the year 1719." The last item, "Four Chinese Books, with Cutts," apparently supplied the drawings for the

¹ Harvard Percy Papers, folder 265.

² The year is not indicated. It was probably 1758, for during that year Percy did most of his work on the novel. See Powell, *op cit.* 448.

novel. This supposition is borne out by Percy's note in the Preface :¹

N.B. We beg leave to inform the Reader that the plates prefixed to these volumes are only given as curiosities, being copied from prints in a Chinese history, that was found among the Translator's papers. In this book every page of Chinese characters was faced with one of these cuts.

Thus we see that Percy's phrase "the Translator's papers" is pleasantly intriguing to the imagination, suggesting a possible happy wealth of materials, but that instead, the whole Wilkinson store seems to have consisted of the three foregoing items. If there had been other papers, they would surely have been mentioned somewhere, perhaps with the same list of items, even though secured later, since two pages of this memorandum were vacant. Certain it is, these three "articles" were all that Percy carried with him at this time to Easton Maudit.

We may now check over the other parts of Percy's Chinese books to see if they could have been from the Wilkinson papers. The sources of the remainder of the material included between the covers of *Hau Kiou Chooan*, that is, the "Collection of Chinese Proverbs and Apothegms," and the "Fragments of Chinese Poetry," concluding volumes three and four respectively, were duly acknowledged by Percy in those sections. His "List of books from whence the following Notes are extracted"² contains twenty-six titles. Preceding this list, he mentions his use of various libraries, but especially that of the Earl of Sussex. It was his patron's library, therefore, which furnished much of the material for critical study of the Chinese. This may account partially for the dedication of *Hau Kiou Chooan* to the "House of Sussex," and of the *Miscellaneous Pieces* to Lady Longueville, the grandmother of Lord Sussex. It is of incidental interest that Percy used two different forms of Du Halde. He says³ that his references are to the folio translation, and that he has occasionally had recourse to the original French edition. One of these he gives in the list of sources as "'A description of the empire of China and of Chinese Tartary' from the French of P. du Halde. London, 1738, 2 vols." This was the original French and in folio. The other, the translation, is indicated in the postscript of a letter to Dodsley, dated April 16, 1761 :

¹ *Hau Kiou Chooan*, I, xxxii.

² Preface, xxix-xxxii.

³ Preface, xxix and 2. (Note kindly furnished by Mr. Powell.)

I hope you rec'd safe your 4 Vols. of Du Halde 8 vo. w'ch you were so obliging as to continue for some time in my hands.¹

It is evident, therefore, that the Wilkinson MSS. supplied for *Hau Kiou Chooan* all but the notes and the literary bits—proverbs and poetry. It is also evident that in his preparation of the novel, Percy had found much other material. It could hardly be expected, therefore, that he would desist when furnished with such a formidable store as indicated by his bibliography. He was well on his way toward the compilation of the *Miscellaneous Pieces relating to the Chinese*.

Before going on with Percy's work with the Chinese pieces, we may examine a little his relations with Wilkinson. Percy seems to have been on terms of more than casual friendship with the Captain judging from the informality of Wilkinson's note already quoted, written upon the return of the Chinese papers. Further, there is evidence of Percy's familiarity with Wilkinson in the diary entry of February 27, 1759: "Din'd at Mr. Stuart's: Mr. Turner and Mr. Wilkinson there."² We must admit that the date here follows rather than precedes the borrowing of the manuscripts, and also that there is no certainty that this "Mr. Wilkinson" is Captain J. Wilkinson. Yet the entry encourages the surmise that Percy was well acquainted with Captain Wilkinson, and that this acquaintance had been of some duration. A further note is at least curious. Under date of May 25, 1756, Percy mentions a Miss Wilkinson: "Went to Saddler's Wells, with him (Rolt, a cousin of Percy's by marriage). Mad. Catherine and Miss Wilkinson perform'd."³ All of this is admittedly inconclusive, but it furnishes good food for speculation. If the events bear no unquestioned connection, at least they are interestingly close in association. For it should be remembered that Percy's attention to the Wilkinsons seems to have reached its height at this period. Naturally he would have been likely to note any event with which they were connected. After the Chinese works were finished, he appears not to have mentioned the family again except in the "Advertisement" quoted by Douce. There Percy's tone suggests that he had long ago lost touch with them.

¹ Harvard Percy Papers, folder 259. The folio, published by Cave, 1738-41, 2 vols.; the octavo, translation by Brookes, published by John Watts, 1736, 4 vols. (Note kindly furnished by Mr. Powell.)

² Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 32336, fol. 20.

³ *Ibid.* fol. 9.

Turning now to Percy's task of editing *Hau Kiou Chooan*, I have been encouraged to ponder over Mr. Powell's remark: "Percy apparently did not feel equal to a discourse on Chinese writing," and therefore he ignored the suggestion from Griffiths to "introduce the whole with a prefatory discourse upon the manner of writing in China."¹ I am inclined to believe there is another explanation of the omission of the "prefatory discourse" from *Hau Kiou Chooan*. Part of the difficulty comes from the interpretation of the term, "prefatory discourse." The phrase suggests a formal, somewhat extended treatise. Percy may not have so considered it. He may have felt that his Preface of some twenty pages satisfied Griffiths's requirement. However, this seems doubtful not only on the face of it but also for other reasons. First, "manner of writing" might be taken to mean either the alphabetical characters or the qualities of literary excellence. Apparently it meant the former to Percy. That he studied this phase with some care is shown by three pieces of manuscript concerned with Chinese ideograms, one of which bears a note, "To face the Title, Vol. 1"; and contains twenty letters in three double columns, with the footnote, "Chinese Characters refer'd to in Page 31, 32, 34."² It will be recalled also that in the "Four Chinese Books, with Cutts," cited earlier in this paper, "every page of Chinese characters was faced with one of these cuts," and that Percy retained these books longer than the other Wilkinson papers. Evidently the linguistic features interested him, and he had from this source a considerable amount of material for study.³ However, neither in the twenty pages of the Preface nor at any other point in *Hau Kiou Chooan* did Percy treat the symbols of the Chinese language. Nor were they "referred to in Pages 31, 32, 34." The supposition is natural, then, that either he did not write the treatise or that he joined it to a different body of material.

We find, therefore, the inviting suggestion that the "prefatory discourse upon the manner of writing in China" was incorporated (for reasons that may be rather easily surmised) in *Miscellaneous Pieces relating to the Chinese* (1762) instead of in *Hau Kiou Chooan*

¹ *Op cit.* 446-7.

² Harvard Percy Papers, folder 265.

³ Percy's further study of this subject is indicated by a manuscript of sixteen quarto pages containing his unfinished "Remarks on the History of China, in the Modern Universal History, Vol. 8th." Nearly half of this manuscript is devoted to Chinese linguistics. It is now in the Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, Calif., Marvin H M 6173.

(176
leng
on t
here
for
volu
in p
inter
he l
Piec
Ano
prin
catal
the p
S
atten
At fi
with
belie
were
inclu
A fe
mark
"Fra
limin
the I
prepa
of a
Evan
"Spe
a wor
the P
was
Choo
much
to be
colle

1
2
3
Bishop

(1761). In this collection, the opening paper, thirty-six pages in length, and following the short preface, is entitled, "A Dissertation on the Language and Characters of the Chinese." Further, we here discover the clue to the manuscript notes mentioned above, for the table of "characters" does face the title page of the first volume, and bears the footnote, "Chinese Characters referr'd to in pag. 31, 32, 34." It seems likely, therefore, that if Percy at first intended this study of Chinese "characters" for *Hau Kiou Chooan*, he later changed his mind and transferred it to the *Miscellaneous Pieces*, where he no doubt felt that it would be more appropriate. Another detail of interest is that this "Dissertation" was apparently printed separately, as it is so entered in the British Museum catalogue.¹ This would further tend to indicate that Percy shifted the piece.

Still one more point relative to Percy's Chinese study deserves attention. It concerns the poetry section in *Hau Kiou Chooan*. At first glance, this and the other extraneous selections bound up with the novel seem oddly out of place. Perhaps there is reason to believe that these parts, except the argument of the Chinese play, were actually intended to be separate and distinct units, and were included with the novel only as a matter of temporary convenience. A few facts give support to such a notion. First, there is a very marked separation of these units from the novel. Preceding the "Fragments of Chinese Poetry" in Vol. IV, there are three preliminary prose articles—an "Advertisement," a "Dissertation on the Poetry of the Chinese," and an "Introduction." Such heavy preparatory treatment would seem to be intended for the opening of a volume. This idea is strengthened by Percy's statement to Evan Evans in 1762 about his proposed comprehensive collection, "Specimens of the ancient Poetry of Different Nations."² "Such a work," he explains, "m't fill up two neat pocket Volumes. Besides the Erse Poetry, the Runic Poetry, and some Chinese Poetry that was published last winter at the end of a book called *Hau Kiou Chooan* or the *Pleasing History*, 4 vols." Percy states that he has much other material in view.³ At least some of these sections were to be published separately, each "in a shilling pamphlet." The collection as a whole, however, was never brought to completion,

¹ B.M. 826.a.4. Unhappily I have not been able to examine this text.

² Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 32330, fol. 39, August 14, 1762.

³ This collection is discussed at some length in my forthcoming study of Bishop Percy's Life and Works.

and the Chinese poems remained in their first position of semi-obscurity. Further, the section devoted to "A Collection of Chinese Proverbs and Apothegms" apparently followed a similar course. At this particular time, Percy was engaged in a projected collection of proverbs. It was apparently to include specimens from various nations. His friend, Rice Williams, supplied Welsh material; Scotch specimens were also to be gathered.¹ But the project was soon afterwards dropped in favour of the poetic collection.² Both the "Fragments of Chinese Poetry" and the "Collection of Chinese Proverbs and Apothegms" were thus apparently first designed for publication in some other form than that which they now appear.

In thus uncovering a few steps further of Percy's work on his Chinese books, we find two or three points catching attention especially. First, he began with a comparatively meagre supply of materials, furnished by Wilkinson. Next, he energetically sought all supplementary specimens and treatises available. Finally, he shifted the sections about in a surprising way. We come to see a new significance in Grainger's commendation: ³ "You have been at great pains in collecting your notes to the Chinese History. They throw much light upon it; and to deal fairly with you, I think they constitute the most valuable part of the book."

¹ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 32330, fol. 5, April 18, 1761.

² *Ibid.* fol. 14.

³ Nichols, *Illustrations*, vii, 280-81.

THREE ASPECTS OF SOUTHEY

By HERBERT G. WRIGHT

I. REMINISCENCES OF COLERIDGE IN SOUTHEY'S *MADOC*

THE association of Southey and Coleridge was so close that, setting aside their collaboration in *Joan of Arc*, it would occasion no surprise to find traces of it in the work of Southey. Two instances may be pointed out in *Madoc*. The first of these occurs in Part I, Section 4, where the first voyage of Madoc to the New World is narrated. The description of the irksome sameness of the voyage is, as we shall prove later, in the main based on Southey's own experience of the sea between Falmouth and Lisbon, but the lines

Day after day, day after day, the same,
A weary waste of waters

carry one back to *The Ancient Mariner*.

More notable is the similarity in the description of the greenish light effects associated with sunset. This was a phenomenon in which Coleridge was particularly interested. *Fears in Solitude*, written in 1798, describes how

At eve
The level sunshine glimmers with green light,

and in the *Dejection Ode*, four years later, Coleridge says :

All this long eve, so balmy and serene,
Have I been gazing on the western sky,
And its peculiar tint of yellow green,

while in the next stanza the poet declares that he cannot hope to be freed from his despondency by contemplating the beauty of Nature, not even though he gaze for ever

On that green light that lingers in the west.

Southey's attention was caught by the same phenomenon which grew so familiar to him that he read with some astonishment in Bishop Heber's *Journal* that he never noticed the pale translucent green of an evening sky till he saw it on his voyage to India.¹ In the

¹ *Commonplace Book*, ed. Warter, vol. iv, p. 7.

second part of *Madoc*, Section 26, Southey alludes to this sunset tint. He describes how the Aztecs, singing an ancient song, wend their way to a holy mountain and as they do so, look out over the plain towards the sunset. Then occur these lines :

Still on the light,
The last green light that lingers in the west,
Their looks are fastened.

As we have seen, both Southey and Coleridge were evidently close observers of this light phenomenon and might well have mentioned it independently, but the verbal similarity of the second line in this passage to the line quoted from the *Dejection Ode* makes it probable that we have here an unconscious reminiscence on Southey's part.¹ It should be pointed out, however, that the addition of "last," emphasising as it does the gradual waning of the light, enriching the vowel harmony and reinforcing the alliteration, enhances the suggestive and haunting beauty of Coleridge's line.

2. SOUTHEY'S *MADOC* AND PANTISOCRACY

Southey began to compose *Madoc* in 1794, the very year in which he first met Coleridge and discussed with him the notion of pantisocracy. He continued to work at the poem, with interruptions, until the first version was completed in July 1799. As *Madoc*, among other things, dealt with the foundation of a colony in America, one might expect to find that it reflected those plans which were preoccupying the author's mind when he commenced to write it.

That this was actually so may be seen from a letter addressed to Southey by William Taylor on August 2, 1801, in which he says : "You have told and written me much of *Madoc*, but it seemed to me . . . to be too much associated with the cause and interests of pantisocratic philosophy to obtain an undivided suffrage of approbation."² Evidently this was still in Taylor's mind when he wrote to Southey on January 17, 1803, with reference to his plan for settling at Maesgwyn, near Neath, in Glamorganshire. Taylor had urged him to come to Norwich and jestingly remarked : "What a strange prejudice you announce against the east ! Do you still think of imitating the Carthaginian students whom St. Austin mentions in his 'Confessions,' and who were to have gone into the back settlements,

¹ *Madoc* did not appear until three years after the *Dejection Ode* was written.

² Taylor, *Memoir*, ed. Robberds, vol. i, p. 375.

beyond the blue mountains of Africa, to found a Christian platonical pantisocratical republic, and to become the Mango Capaks and Madocs of the paulo-post-future Tombuctoos? Is it to be so much nearer the Ohio, that you prefer the Severn to the Waveney; and do you love the airs of the Atlantic because they revive in your recollection the Atlantis of your early idea?"¹ The result of Taylor's criticism was that when Southey began to revise and recast *Madoc*, he sought to eliminate all trace of pantisocratic conceptions. Consequently, on March 22, 1804, he was able to inform his friend: "Your objections to the story, as being connected with a particular system, are done away."²

Nevertheless, in a few passages it is perhaps still possible to discern dimly something of the original idea. It is indeed barely discoverable in the description of Caermadoc, the colony founded by Madoc and his men in America. The leader of the expedition looks down with pride upon the settlement in the mountain valley, with its rocky stream and quiet lake:

What he had found an idle wilderness
Now gave rich increase to the husbandman,
For Heaven had blest their labour. Flourishing
He left the happy vale; and now he saw
More fields reclaimed, more habitations reared,
More harvests rising round. The reptile race,
And every beast of rapine, had retired
From man's asserted empire; and the sound
Of axe, and dashing oar, and fisher's net,
And song beguiling toil, and pastoral pipe,
Were heard, where late the solitary hills
Gave only to the mountain cataract
Their wild response.³

But the communistic organisation which has produced this transformation is more clearly visible in the following lines:

Early at morn the colonists arose;
Some pitch the tent-pole, and pin down the lines
That stretch the o'er-awning canvas; to the wood
Others, with saw and axe and bill, for stakes
And undergrowth to weave the wicker walls;
These to the ships, with whom Cadwallon sends
The Elk and Bison, broken to the yoke.⁴

Another passage, which confirms this impression, occurs a little later in the poem. Again the labours of the settlers are described:

¹ Taylor, *Memoir*, vol. i, pp. 442-43.

² *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 490.

³ *Madoc*, Part II, Section 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Part II, Section 3.

All
 Now to their toil betake them. Some go fell
 The stately wood ; some from the tree low-laid
 Hew the huge boughs ; here round the fire they char
 The stake-points ; here they level with a line
 The ground-plot, and infix the ready piles,
 Or, interknitting them with osiers, weave
 The wicker wall ; others along the lake,
 From its shoal waters, gather reeds and canes,
 Light roofing, suited to the genial sky.
 The woodman's measured stroke, the regular saw,
 The wain slow-creaking, and the voice of man
 Answering his fellow, or, in single toil,
 Chearing his labour with a cheerful song,
 Strange concert made to those fierce Aztecan.¹

It is true that, two lines further on, we are told that

All overseeing, and directing all,
 From place to place moved Madoc, and beheld
 The dwellings rise.²

But this looks like an afterthought, and even though Madoc is shown as the director-general of the work, it appears to be done by co-operation and not by individual enterprise. Taken by themselves, these passages would be an insecure foundation on which to build an argument about the effects of Southey's pantisocratic views on *Madoc*, but the correspondence with Taylor seems to justify such an interpretation.

3. REMINISCENCES IN *MADOC* OF SOUTHEY'S JOURNEYS TO AND IN SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

Southey stayed twice in the Iberian peninsula, from December 1795 to May 1796, and again from April 1800 to June 1801, and traces of the voyages as well as of his residence in Spain and Portugal may be discerned in *Madoc*. The poem contains two descriptions of a voyage. The first, which occurs in Part I, is placed in the mouth of the hero and relates his experiences during the crossing to America ; the second is found in Part II, and tells, much more briefly in order to avoid repetition, of his return to Aztlan. The picture of Madoc's fleet is drawn from first-hand observation :

Their sails all swelling with the eastern breeze,
 Their tightened cordage clattering to the mast,
 Steady they rode the main ; the gale aloft
 Sung in the shrouds, the sparkling waters hissed
 Before, and frothed, and whitened far behind.

¹ *Madoc*, Part II, Section 11.

² *Ibid.*

Southey himself knew not only what it was to run before a fresh breeze, but also how it felt to be borne shorewards by light winds. He could therefore write with understanding of Madoc "wafted by gentle winds o'er gentle waves," and of how

gentle airs, thus breathed,
Or seemed to breathe, fresh fragrance from the shore.

He had also welcomed the sight of land and had experienced relief at the prospect of escape to more congenial surroundings. On the occasion of his second voyage, he wrote that they made the Berlings in the evening, and that he got up at sunrise the next morning and saw the sun resting upon the rock.¹ There is more emotion in his account of how he sighted land after his first voyage, and with good cause, for a violent storm had exposed his life to danger. "The sun shone over the land," he says, "and half hiding it by the morning mists, gave a transitory beauty. If the eye cannot be filled by an object of vaster sublimity than the boundless ocean, when beheld from shore, neither can it ever dwell on a more delightful prospect than that of land, dimly discovered from the sea and gradually growing distinct."² In view of the impressions which Southey thus received, it is interesting to read the account of how Madoc's men often and eagerly climbed to the masthead to look for signs of the New World :

They gazed, and fancied, in the distant sky,
Their promised shore beneath the evening cloud,
Or seen, low lying, through the haze of morn.

Another passage, which tells of Madoc's emotions as he looked for the first glimpse of this unknown land, is also significant :

On the last evening, a long shadowy line
Skirted the sea ; how fast the night closed in !
I stood upon the deck, and watched till dawn.
But who can tell what feelings filled my heart,
When, like a cloud, the distant land arose
Grey from the ocean ?

and the same is true of the description of his delight on beholding Aztlan once more :

Now how joyfully he views the land,
Skirting, like morning clouds, the dusky sea !

Quite apart from the perils and the discomforts of a voyage, Southey was acquainted with its monotony. On his way back to

¹ *Letters*, ed. Warter, vol. i, p. 109.

² *Letters written during a Journey in Spain and a Short Residence in Portugal*, 1808, vol. i, p. 2.

England in 1801, he encountered adverse winds and had to bear with fourteen wearisome days before he drew near Falmouth. Writing while still on board, he complained of "the insufferable tedium, the millstone weight of time!" "I would write practical comments upon the book of Job," he said, "if there were a Bible on board. A day's travelling in wind and wet over a wilderness of gum-cistus is positive happiness in comparison. England! England! Oh, I do long to stand on firm ground, and eat fresh bread and drink fresh water! Not even a porpoise pops up to amuse. Even the fish-line drags on as idly as I myself."¹ The poet who felt this monotony so intensely was therefore well able to imagine vividly the emotions of Madoc and his men as they steered westwards on an even longer voyage towards an unknown shore:

Day after day, day after day, the same,
A weary waste of waters! Still the breeze
Hung heavy in our sails, and we held on
One even course; a second week was gone,
And now another past, and still the same,
Waves beyond waves, the interminable sea!
 I saw
The sun still sink below the endless waves,
And still at morn, beneath the farthest sky,
Unbounded ocean heaved. Day after day,
Before the steady gale we drove along,
Day after day! The fourth week now had past;
Still all around was sea, the eternal sea!

Vaguely recalling, as it does, *The Ancient Mariner*, this striking passage is nevertheless firmly rooted in Southey's own experience.

However, powerful as was the impression left on Southey by the irksome uniformity of a sea-voyage, he was perhaps even more deeply moved by the recollection of the storm in December 1795, to which allusion has already been made. He was but twenty-one at the time, and there can be no doubt that the memory of this fierce winter gale was indelibly stamped on the mind of the young landsman. Time after time in his private correspondence and in the *Letters* which he published about the tour, he speaks of the roughness of the voyage, of how he was tossed about by wind and wave, and of how the Spanish sailors turned in "to bed and to prayers."² Writing six weeks after he had landed at Corunna, he told Wynn: "The dead-lights were up sixty hours; the danger was magnified by my apprehensions and the unskilfulness of Spanish sailors;

¹ *Letters*, ed. Warter, vol. i, p. 161.

² *Letters written during a Journey in Spain and a Short Residence in Portugal*, vol. i, p. 2, and vol. ii, p. 48.

and I can now form a tolerable idea of what a man feels at the point of death."¹ This had surely a large share in causing the violent agitation which Southey displayed on learning that Wordsworth's brother John had been lost in the wreck of the *Abergavenny*. He spoke of it as a subject which made his very flesh quiver, and declared: "It has disordered me from head to foot . . . this dreadful shipwreck has left me utterly unable to do anything else. . . . Of all deaths it is the most dreadful, from the circumstances of terror which accompany it."² At any rate, an echo of his early experience is heard in *Madoc*, when the hero says:

I saw
The clouds hang thick and heavy o'er the deep ;
And heavily, upon the long slow swell,
The vessel laboured on the labouring sea.
The reef-points rattled on the shivering sail,
At fits, the sudden gust howled ominous,
Anon, with unremitting fury raged ;
High rolled the mighty billows, and the blast
Swept from their sheeted sides the showery foam.
Vain, now, were all the seamen's homeward hopes,
Vain all their skill ! we drove before the storm.
'Tis pleasant, by the cheerful hearth, to hear
Of tempests, and the dangers of the deep,
And pause at times, and feel that we are safe ;
Then listen to the perilous tale again,
And, with an eager and suspended soul,
Woo Terror to delight us ; but to hear
The roaring of the raging elements,
To know all human skill, all human strength,
Avail not ; to look round, and only see
The mountain wave incumbent, with its weight
Of bursting waters, o'er the reeling bark,
O God, this is indeed a dreadful thing !
And he who hath endured the horror, once,
Of such an hour, doth never hear the storm
Howl round his house, but he remembers it,
And thinks upon the suffering mariner !³

During his stay in Spain and Portugal nothing interested Southey more than the religion of these two countries. He speaks of it many times, and especially of the ceremonies connected with various solemn festivals. Thus, while at Lisbon in 1796, he describes one of the Lent processions: "There were about ten saints carried, as large as life, preceded by an imaged crucifix. Some little boys, dressed with silver wings, led the procession: and the Host concluded it, borne as is usual under a purple pall. . . . These

¹ *Letters*, ed. Warter, vol. i, p. 20.

² *Life and Correspondence*, ed. C. C. Southey, vol. ii, p. 321, and *Letters*, ed. Warter, vol. i, p. 318.

³ Part I, Section 4.

images are all carried by men, their faces veiled, and their feet bare.¹ On the occasion of his second visit he tells his brother Thomas and his friend Danvers about the Corpus Christi procession at even greater length.² On June 15, 1800, he writes from Lisbon: "Thursday last we saw the long-looked-for Procession of the Body of God. The Pix is carried in all other processions empty; in this only it has the wafer, this is the only Real Presence. The Pix is a silver vessel . . . the holiest church utensil." Having spoken of the elaborate preparations and the pomp and splendour of the train, he refers to the brotherhoods who took part, an immense number of men in red or grey cloaks. Sometimes Southey also went to church and was present at the mass. Thus, writing from Mafra on October 6, 1800, he speaks of the Festival of St. Francisco, and says: "We went to mass; the Prince followed the Host as it was carried round the church: in the evening there was a procession, and the Prince paraded with it." Southey viewed these ceremonies with mingled feelings. Often he was seized with an intense dislike of them and denounced them as "idolatry," "puppet-shows," or "raree-shows," and he grew melancholy at the sight of "uprightness of intention and energy so misapplied." Nevertheless, he knew nothing but respect and pity for the venerable monks, "old men grey-headed, thin as austerity could make old age, so pale, so hermit-like," and declared that one ought to see these processions with Catholic eyes.

This was just what he himself sought to do when he made use of these reminiscences of Portugal in *Madoc*. It should be explained that when Southey carried his hero to the lonely island of Bardsey off the coast of Caernarvonshire, he was at a loss, for he had never seen it himself and could not visualise the scene. When he travelled with Wynn in North Wales in 1801, he was obliged to defer a visit to Bardsey until a later date. In point of fact this visit was never paid, with the result that after Southey settled down at Keswick, in 1803, to complete his poem, he was seriously embarrassed for want of information. Accordingly he told Wynn, on October 28, that he was about to write this part of the poem, and asked if Wynn had Powell's *History of Cambria* and Warrington's *History of Wales*, so that he might know which of the old kings were buried in Bardsey.

¹ *Letters written during a Journey in Spain and a Short Residence in Portugal*, vol. ii, pp. 143-45.

² *Letters*, ed. Warter, vol. i, pp. 104-6, and *Life and Correspondence*, ed. C. C. Southey, vol. ii, p. 83.

On November 8, Wynn replied : " I have not yet been able to learn anything about Bardsey—when I do I will write it for you." But apparently Southey was too impatient to await this information, for on November 24 he wrote : " Last night I finished my Bardsey book. . . . With local and particularising scenery of course nothing could be done, for I have not been able to find any account whatever of the island." He decided therefore to eke out this section by introducing a description of a fine autumn day and by utilising his " Catholic knowledge in a service for the dead." The passage in question occurs in Part I, Section 13, and it will readily be perceived how Southey's experiences in Portugal came to his aid. It runs thus :

To this Isle,
Where his forefathers were consigned to dust,
Did Madoc come in natural piety ;
And therefore had he made his coming known,
Ordering a solemn service for their souls.
Therefore for this the Church that day was dressed ;
For this the Abbot, in his alb arrayed,
At the high altar stood ; for this infused,
Sweet incense from the waving thuribule
Rose like a mist, and the grey brotherhood
Chaunted the solemn mass. And now on high
The mighty Mystery had been elevate,
And now around the graves the bretheren
In long array proceed ; each in his hand,
Tall as the staff of some wayfaring man,
Bears the brown taper, with their daylight flame
Dimming the chearful day. Before the train
The Cross is borne, where, fashioned to the life,
In shape, and size, and ghastly colouring,
The awful Image hangs. Next, in its shrine
Of gold and crystal, by the Abbot held,
The mighty Mystery came ; on either hand
Three Priests uphold above, on silver wands,
The purple pall. With holy water next
A father went, therewith, from hyssop branch,
Sprinkling the graves ; the while, with one accord,
The solemn psalm of mercy all intoned.

The sacred odours of the incense still
Floated ; the daylight and the taper-flames
Commingled, dimming each, and each bedimmed ;
And as the slow procession paced along,
Still to their hymn, as if in symphony,
The regular foot-fall sounded ; swelling now,
Their voices in one chorus, loud and deep,
Rung o'er the echoing aisle ; and when it ceased,
The silence of that huge and sacred pile
Came on the heart.

It was essential here that Southey should place himself in the position of Madoc, a devout Catholic of the Middle Ages, and it is

remarkable that he should have done this with such sympathy. For all his strong Protestant feelings, however, Southey was able at times to enter into the spirit of Catholicism. As an example, we may quote a letter written from Lisbon on May 23, 1800, which, though in some ways critical, shows unusual insight. "It is a fine religion for an enthusiast," he says, "for one who can let his feelings remain awake, and opiate his reason. Never was goddess so calculated to win upon the human heart as the Virgin Mary; and devotees, Moravians as well as Catholics, not unfrequently mingle the feelings of earthly and spiritual love, as strangely as our Bible has mixed the language in Solomon's Song."¹ These words have a direct bearing on a passage in Part II, Section 8, of *Madoc*. It describes how the Hoamen have been converted to Christianity by Madoc's victory over the Great Serpent. He leads the procession:

Bareheaded he,
Following the servant of the altar, leads
The reverential train. Before them, raised
On high, the sacred Images are borne.
There, in faint semblance, holiest Mary bends
In virgin beauty o'er her blessed babe,
A sight, that almost to idolatry
Might win the soul by love.

The passage continues with a vivid picture which obviously contains yet another reminiscence:

But who can gaze
Upon that other form, which on the rood
In agony is stretched? his hands transfixed,
And lacerate with the body's pendent weight;
The black and deadly paleness of his face,
Streaked with the blood which from that crown of scorn
Hath ceased to flow; the side-wound streaming still;
And open still those eyes, from which the look
Not yet hath past away, that went to Heaven,
When, in that hour, the Son of Man exclaimed,
Forgive them, for they know not what they do!

These two passages and the vignette preceding the exordium to *Madoc*, which shows a cross with the words "In hoc signo vinces," explain Southey's fear that some wiseacre might suspect him of favouring the Roman Catholic religion.² As it turned out, this apprehension was unfounded, for the criticism of the poem was based on very different grounds.

¹ *Life and Correspondence*, ed. C. C. Southey, vol. ii, p. 72.

² Cf. his letter to Bedford, January 20, 1805: "My emblem of the cross, prefixed to the poem, with the *In hoc signo*, and what I have said in the poem of the Virgin Mary, is more liable to misconstruction than I could wish" (*Life and Correspondence*, ed. C. C. Southey, vol. ii, p. 312). See also his letter to Wynn on April 6, 1805 (*ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 322).

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

A NOTE ON LYDGATE'S VERSES ON THE KINGS OF ENGLAND

THE *Verses on the Kings of England* consists of fifteen practically worthless stanzas in rhyme royal, first printed by Wynkyn de Worde. It was printed from manuscript sources by James Gairdner in *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century* (Camden Society, 1876). Gairdner's main source was Ashmole MS. 59, and he thought the verses must have been written in that manuscript "about 1456". It would have been more reasonable to suggest the precise date 1461; for the fifteen stanzas are followed by the title *Edwardus Quartus*, which could not have been inserted before 1461, while the fact that no stanza follows to correspond with that title would suggest that the scribe thought it would be appropriate that a stanza on the new king should be added to Lydgate's verses, but that none such had as yet been written. Gairdner appended the stanza on Edward IV from another manuscript, Harleian 2251; and when Wynkyn de Worde printed the text, the poem, if such it is to be called, had been continued to Henry VIII.

Trinity College Dublin MS. 516 (which MacCracken omits from the list of manuscripts for the "Kings of England" in his *Lydgate Canon*) gives the text in an earlier form than do the manuscripts used by Gairdner. In it the title *Edwardus Quartus* is not found, for, in fact, Henry VI was still on the throne. This can be proved as follows: The T.C.D. MS. ends "Longe to rejoyse and regne here in his ryght". Gairdner's MS. ends "Long he hathe rejoyced bothe by day and nyght". It is clear that the former makes sense only if the king is still on his throne; the latter makes sense whether he is alive or has recently died, and therefore may well be supposed to be a rough and ready emendation made to suit the fact that he was no longer reigning. In either case, the words sound odd as applied to Henry VI. At what time of that poor king's career could a poet say such words of him? The words, at all

events, suggest a date not much later than 1442. The marriage of Henry V was referred to in the previous stanza, but the marriage of Henry VI (1445) is not mentioned.

In the T.C.D. MS. the following important variations are to be found :

- | | | |
|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| William the Conqueror | 1. 7. | For "Thys saythe thys croneculere "
Read "Thus saythe " (etc.). |
| Henry I | 1. 2. | For "to London "
Read "at London ". |
| | 1. 3. | For "Robert of Normandy "
Read "Robert Duc of Normandy ". |
| | 1. 5. | For "Reconsyld alle rancor sette by hynde "
Read "They reconsyld, al rancor " (etc.). |
| Stephen | 1. 2. | For "Ganne crosse the sayle "
Read "Gan to cros his sayle ". |
| | 1. 6. | For "He bare hys crowne he hadde noo reste "
Read "He bare hys crowne <i>and</i> hadde noo reste ". |
| Henry II | 1. 2. | For "A manly knyght "
Read "A ful manly knyght ". |
| | | In l. 5, the scribe of the Dublin MS. was evidently so interested in the historical allusion that he wrote "Slew sent Thomas of Canterbury ", thereby destroying the rhyme. |
| Richard I | 1. 5. | For "By deth lamentable "
Read "By deth ful lamentable ". |
| John | 1. 4. | For "By mysghovernaunce "
Read "By His Mysghovernaunce ". |
| Henry III | 1. 1. | For "of IX yere "
Read "of IX yere age "—thus restoring the rhyme. |
| | 1. 2. | For "as I fynde "
Read "as I rede "—thus restoring the rhyme. |
| | 1. 4. | For "delytede in "
Read "delytede him in ". |
| Edward I | 1. 4. | For "in the dyspyte of ther myghte "
Read "dispite of al their might ". |
| | 1. 7. | For "and lythe at Westmynster, thys noo lesyng "
Read "Lith at Westmynster, this trouthe and no lesyng ". |
| Edward II | 1. 5. | For "He toke venjaunce "
Read "Bi deth he toke venjaunce ". |
| Richard II | 1. 3. | For "Queen Anne "
Read "Queen Anne of Bewme ". |
| | 1. 4. | For "He lystede to see "
Read "Who lyst to see ". |

- Henry V 1. 2. For "ande manly"
 Read "ande right manly".
1. 3. For "Provyde"
 Read "Preved".
1. 5. For "spousyde the doughter of Fraunce,
 Katerynne"
 Read "egal to stonde among the worthi IX".
- Henry VI 1. 2. For "Heretaunce"
 Read "Enheritaunce".
1. 6. For "A vertusse lyffe, and chosyn for hys knyght"
 Read "Of virtuous lif, and chose him for hys
 knyght".
1. 7. For "Long he hathe rejoyced bothe by day and
 nyght"
 Read "Longe to rejoyse and regne here in hys
 ryght".

The T.C.D. MS. 516 contains, also, Lydgate's "Dietary," the text varying in detail from that used by J. O. Halliwell, *Minor Poems of Lydgate* (Percy Society). The most important variations are :

- Stanza 1 1. 5. For "In thyn age with wymmen have thow nat
 ado"
 Read "With wymmen aged flesschely have not
 ado"—so in the Scotch version published by
 Skeat in his edition of the Bruce (S.T.S. 1890),
 vol. 2, p. 215.
- Stanza 3 1. 4. For "In spendyng mesurable"
 Read "Of fedying mesurable"—so in Skeat-Bruce.
 The same variation occurs in the version published
 by Furnival in the Babees Book (E.E.T.S. 1868),
 p. 52.
- Stanza 5 1. 2. For "Blyth"
 Read "Blyve"—the rhyme word being "stryve".
1. 8. For "Peas"
 Read "Reste".
- Stanza 6 1. 2. For "Mystis Blake"
 Read "Again Mystis Blake"—so in Skeat-Bruce
 and Furnival—Babees Book.
1. 4. For "Preve"
 Read "Cheve"—Skeat-Bruce reads "Eschewe".
1. 8. For "To encrese the and thy possessioun"
 Read "Thee to encrese and al thy possessioun".
- Stanza 8 1. 8. Omitted in Halliwell's Text.
 Read "No worldly joye last but a while". The
 same line with minor changes is in Skeat-Bruce
 and Furnival—Babees Book.

- Stanza 9 1. 7. For "For nothing more contrary to theyr complexiouns"
 Read "Fro thynges contrary to heyre complexiouns"—so in Skeat-Bruce and Furnival—
 Babees Book.

CURT F. BÜHLER.

THE SURVIVAL OF A STYLISTIC FEATURE OF INDO-EUROPEAN POETRY IN GERMANIC, ESPECIALLY IN MIDDLE-ENGLISH

DR. HERMANN HIRT in his *Indogermanische Grammatik*, Teil 1, 1927, p. 126, drew attention to a stylistic feature of Ind. Gmc. poetry found in Old Indian, Greek and Latin, whereby three names of which the last is qualified by an epithet, occur in one line. Hirt quotes two examples from Germanic:

Beow. 61, *Heorogar and Hroðgar and Halga til*, and
 Nib. 4, 2, *Gunther unde Gernôt und Giselher der junge*.

In Anglo-Saxon poetry there are two other examples:

Beow. 2434, *Herebeald ond Hæðcyn oððe Hygelac min*.
 Genesis 2045, *Aner and Manre, Escol þriddan*.

In the Elder Edda there are no examples of personal names used in this manner, nor are there any in the Old High German alliterative poetry (*Das Hildebrandslied*, *Das Wessobrunner Gebet*, *Muspilli*, *Die Merseburger Zaubersprüche*), nor in the work of Otfrid.

In the *Nibelungenlied*, however, there are more examples than the one above quoted by Hirt (not, it will be observed, correctly quoted); the following may be mentioned:

4, 2-3, *Gunther unde Gêrnôt, die recken lobelich,
 und Giselher der junge, ein ûz erwelter degen* (cf. st. 543).
 (Here there is no doubt that the three names were originally
 in one line; many other examples occur throughout the
 poem.)

1214, 2-3, *Gêrnôt und Giselher, die stolzen ritter guot,
 und Gunther der rîche*. . . .

235, 1-2, *Sindolt und Hûnolt, die Gêrnôtes man,
 und Rûmolt der küene*. . . .

Lines of a similar kind in which there is evidence of subsequent corruption are the following: 1148, 1-2, 1809, 1-2, etc.

cf. 200, 1, *Sindolt und Hûnolt und ouch Gêrnôt*,

a type of line found also in stanzas 201, 709, 1729, 2225 and 2322 ; some of these may originally have been of the traditional kind.

cf. 211, 3, *Sindolt und Hünolt und Ortwin der degen* ;
563, 1, *Sindolt und Hünolt und Rümolt der degen*.

Hence there is little doubt that the usage is ancient and not accidental.

In the Old Saxon *Héliand* 4738 we find :

Jákobe endi Jóhannese endi thena guodan Pétruse ;

there are similar examples in Middle-English, but it is rather unlikely that we have here a survival of the stylistic feature in question.

In Middle-English there are numerous examples, most of which are of the accepted type. In nearly every case they are to be found in alliterative poems, partly because of the absence there of any real break with tradition and also because a long line with a medial cæsure will alone provide a suitable metrical form for the device to be employed. The examples will be given in chronological order.

Lazamon's Brut :

9150-1, *Sadoc and Samiel and Symeon þene alde* ;
29945-6, *Margadud and Baldric and Cadwan þe balde*.

Alexander and Dindimus :

518, *Asie and Aufrik and Europ þe grete*.

The Parlement of the Thre Ages :

418, *Affrike and Arraby and Egipt the noble*.
476, *Sir Askanore, Sir Ewayne, Sir Errake fytz lake*.
cf. l. 523, a more doubtful case.

Sir Gawayn and the Green Knight :

553, *Launcelot and Lyonel and Lucan þe gode*.

Patience :

31, *Dame Pouert, Dame Pitee, Dame Penance þe pryde*.

Piers Plowman :

B. VIII, 78, *Dowel and Dobet and Dobest the thridde*,
a line found also in A. and C. in the corresponding lines ;
A. IX, 97, the same line (occurring also in B. and C.).
A. X, 19, *Sir Seowel and Seywel and Herewel the hende*,
(found also in B. and C.).
C. XI, 177, *As Lot dude and Noe and Herodes the daffe*.
B. XVI, 81, *Adam and Abraham and Ysay the prophete*,
(found also in C.).
B. XVI, 82, *Sampson and Samuel and Seynt Iohan the baptiste*,
(found also in C.).

B. XVII, 21, *Iosue and Iudith and Iudas Macabeus*,
(found also in C.).

C. V, 31, *On Wilyman and Wittiman and Waryn Wrynglawe*,
(a more doubtful case).

Sege of Jerusalem :

141, (*Peter*), *James and Jon and Jacob þe ferpe* ;
(E. MS. has *and Iamys þe lasse*.)

Morte Arthure :

36, *Burgoyne and Brabane and Bretayn the lesse* ;
37, *Gyan and Gothelande and Grace the ryche* ;
277, *Belyn and Bremyn and Bawdewyne the thyrd* ;
574, *To Asye and to Affrike and Europe þe large* ;
1606, 1744, *Sir Bawdwyne, Sir Bryane and Sir Bedwere þe ryche* ;
1638, *Sir Clegis, Sir Cleremus, Sir Cleremownde þe noble* ;
2157, *Sir Kayous, Sir Clegis, Sir Cleremownde þe noble* ;
2384, *Sir Berade and Bawdwyne, Sir Bedwar þe ryche* ;
2497, *Sir Clegis, Sir Clarybalde, Sir Clarymownde þe noble*.

The Wars of Alexander :

3765, *Affrike and Asye and Europ þat othire* ;
4144, *Aquiloun and Affrike and Ewrus þe thrid* ;
Correct examples may also be found in ll. 4395, 5273, 5493, 5659,
5665, 5668, 5677. There are also many doubtful examples and
in certain places evidence of corruption, as in the following
couplet :

5489-90, *Sire Camour and ser Cacany with alle þar kidd ostis*,
 & *ane ser Clambert þe kene was king of þer ostis*.

It is most likely that the original reading was :

Sire Camour and ser Cacany and ser Clambert þe kene.

The Destruction of Troy :

1558, *Tricerda, Thetas, Troiana þo soure* ;
1584, *Goldsmaythes, Glouers, Girdillers noble* ;
 similar lines are 1585, 1589 and 1597.
7446, *Palomydon, Philomytes, Philothetes þe grete*.

Death and Life :

107, *Dame Mirth & Dame Meekenes & Dame Mercy þe kinde* ;
327, *Moyes and Methasula & þe meeke Aronn* ;
 (cf. *Patience* l. 32 and the *Héliand* example above.)
328, *Iosua & Ioseph & Iacob þe smoothe* ;
329, *Abraham & Isacc & Esau the roughe* ;
186, *Morninge and Mone, Sir Mischeefe his fere* (?)

Golagros and Gawain :

1234, *David and Josue and Judas the gent*.

A Burlesque (*Rel. Ant.* I, 84) :

17, *With Magot & Margory & Malyn hur sysstur*.

The Song of Roland (E.E.T.S. Extra Series 35, p. 113):

216, *Gauter & Gaisser & Godfray the bolleyn* ;

217, *Barenger & Berard & Bedwar the strang* ;

404, *Markis & Melon & Milo þe proud* ;

517, *to Roulund & Richard & Rayner his broder*.

There are naturally many other cases in Middle-English alliterative poetry which are of a more doubtful kind ; excluding numerous lines in which four names without epithet occur, we have several of the following type :

Death and Life :

102, *Sir Liffe, and Sir Likinge & Sir Loue alsoe*.

Other examples may be found in *The Destruction of Troy* 1591, 8840, 14013, *The Wars of Alexander* 5664, *Morte Arthure* 572.

Dr. Hirt further quotes from the *Voluspá* such lines as :

lǫ né létli, né litu góða

but it is somewhat questionable whether we have here the same phenomenon ; it is, however, interesting to note that several examples of this kind occur in Middle-English ; the following are merely a few chosen at random :

Purity :

121, *Bope with menske and wyth mete and mynstrasy noble* ;

184, *For roborrye and riboudrye and resounes untrue* ;

Death and Life :

44, *parkes and pallaces and pastures full many* ;

The Parlement of the Thre Ages :

9, *The primrose, the perwynke and piliolle þe riche* ;

11, *burgons and blossoms and braunches full swete*.

There can be little doubt that all these examples of lines with three names and an epithet are not a matter of accident. Foreign influence, so far as Middle-English is concerned, is out of the question (there are no examples in Anglo-Norman and Norman-French). We can only conclude that we have here a genuine survival (not necessarily conscious). Middle-English alliterative metre was a more suitable medium than Anglo-Saxon verse, a fact which may account for the presence of so many examples in Middle-English verse, but however that may be, the instances call for an explanation ; if we admit that the examples in *Beowulf* and the *Nibelungenlied* are genuine, there is no apparent reason why those in Middle-English should not be considered genuine also.

J. P. OAKDEN.

THE ROUNDELAY IN THE AUGUST ECLOGUE OF
THE SHEPHEARDES CALENDER

SEVERAL critics of Spenser have remarked on the roughness of the verse in this roundelay, and ascribed it to a desire to represent the rustic character of the singers. It does indeed throw into relief the smoother and more elaborate song of Colin at the end of the eclogue. But I have long suspected that there was another reason for the roundelay's apparent roughness. It has the same fluidity of rhythm as is commonly found with sixteenth-century poets who were writing with a tune in their head instead of to a fixed metrical scheme. As in many of Campion's airs, lines in corresponding positions in different stanzas have often no rhythmic resemblance when read. There seems very little in common between

Now gynneth this roundelay,
and—

As cleare as the christall glasse

though they occupy corresponding positions in the metrical scheme. Lines like this in Campion are quite easy to explain, because the free stress of Tudor music would allow them to fit equally well the same fragment of a tune, and we know Campion had music in mind when he wrote. Is it possible that lines like these in Spenser mean that Spenser was writing with a popular tune in mind?

The opening of the roundelay certainly suggests an older song going back to pre-Reformation times:

It fell upon a holly eve . . .
When holly fathers wont to shrieve.

A parallel case is the old song *Walsingham*, which certainly belongs to the days when Walsingham Abbey was a favourite place of pilgrimage. The song was often refurbished during the sixteenth century, and nearly every version retained in its first stanza a reference to the "shrine" or "palmer" of the original. It looks as though Spenser's roundelay bore traces of an earlier song in the same way; otherwise there is little point in putting such words in the mouths of his shepherds, who elsewhere express the most commendably Protestant sentiments. A reminiscence of an old song would further accentuate the rusticity of the singers in comparison with Colin.

There was a tune called "Heigh ho, holiday" (the refrain of

Spenser's roundelay). Deloney directs a poem to be sung to it in *A Garland of Good Will* (1593). This, too, is termed a roundelay, and is to be sung by two voices, one taking the verses and the other adding a refrain or undersong. Spenser's poem is undivided, Deloney's in eight-line stanzas, but the metre and rhyme-scheme are the same in both, except that the second line of the stanza in Deloney's is sometimes of five syllables and sometimes of seven, while Spenser always has "Heigh ho, holiday" in this position. From this it would seem that "Heigh ho" was repeated when sung to the tune.

The tune itself was noted down by a seventeenth-century worthy, whose commonplace book is now B.M. Add. MS. 4338 (fol. 108). Only the first line and refrain have words, and they are the same as in Spenser's roundelay.

In *England's Helicon* is "A Pastoral Song betweene Phillis and Amarillis, two Nymphes, each answering other line for line," by Henry Constable.¹ It begins :

Phillis : Fie on the sleights that men devise
 Heigh hoe sillie sleights
 When simple Maydes they would entice
 Maydes are young men's chiefe delights,

and in the last line the song is described as a "roundelay." The metre is the same as that of Spenser's roundelay.

Both Constable's and Deloney's roundelays are later than *The Shepheardes Calender*, and the only extant version of the tune has the first line and refrain of Spenser's poem associated with it. It is therefore possible that a new tune was written to Spenser's roundelay or an old one fitted to it after the publication of *The Shepheardes Calender*. But the roughness of Spenser's rhythm, so different from his usual smoothness, and the pre-Reformation reminiscence of his first stanza, make it much more likely that Spenser, Constable, and Deloney all had in mind some old tune traditionally sung by two voices, in the form of alternate verses and undersong, and with the refrain "Heigh ho, holiday."

BRUCE PATTISON.

THE CHAMBERLAIN'S MEN IN 1597

A RECENT visit to Faversham, Rye and Dover has enabled me to clear up a few small points in connection with the provincial tour

¹ *The Sonnets and Other Poems of Henry Constable*, ed. W. C. Hazlitt (1859), p. 68.

of the Lord Chamberlain's company of actors in the summer and autumn of 1597. The extracts relating to the dates on which the company received payments from the various municipal authorities in this year are given by Sir E. K. Chambers in his *William Shakespeare* (II, 321), and may be summarised as follows :

Faversham	About August 1.
Rye	No month recorded.
Dover	Chambers adds : "Murray ¹ puts this between September 3 and 20."
Bristol	September 11 to 17.
Bath	No month recorded.
Marlborough	No month recorded.

My examination of the account books at Faversham, Rye and Dover established two things :

- (1) That the accounts in all three places ran from Michaelmas to Michaelmas (September 29),² thus confirming Chambers' conjecture that the visit to Faversham was in 1597 and not 1596.
- (2) That the visit to Rye occurred in August ; and since the entry is at the end of the accounts for 1596-1597, the visit must have been in August 1597.

There is, however, an obvious difficulty as regards the visit to Dover. According to Murray this took place between September 3 and 20. The accounts, as I have said, run from Michaelmas to Michaelmas ; and since the entry in question occurs in 1596-1597, it follows that they must have been at Dover in September 1597. How can this be reconciled with the fact that they were at Bristol between September 11 and 17 of the same year ?

I think I am able to solve this difficulty. The Dover Chamberlains' accounts for 1596-1597 are preserved in Vol. III of the Dover Corporation accounts, folios 316-348. The heading (folio 316) is as follows :

The accompte of the worshippfull Mr George Binge Maior of Dovor John Haynes John Wade John Benger and Robte Garrett Chamberleyne of the sayd Towne ffrom the (blank) daye of September 1596 untell the (blank) daye of September 1597.

¹ J. T. Murray, *English Dramatic Companies*, ii, 263.

² Except in the case of Rye, where they seem to have begun sometimes on St. Bartholomew's Day (August 24) and sometimes in September.

Then follow the Receipts (folios 316-333), after which come the Payments (folios 334-346).

It is with the payments that we are concerned here. The individual items are recorded in batches, each batch comprising about thirty to fifty items, and at the beginning of each batch (in the left-hand margin) there is a date. These dates run chronologically throughout the year, and are as follows :

October 9 and 23, November 8 and 20, December 4 and 24, January 8, February 7 and 22, March 5 and 22, April 4, 16 and 30, May 14 and 28, June 25, July 9 and 23, August 6, September 3 and 20.

The entry relating to the payment to the Chamberlain's men occurs in the batch headed September 3.

Now, at first glance, one would be inclined to agree with Murray that the payment in question was made on some date between September 3 and 20. But it seems to me more likely that the dates refer to sessions held by the Mayor and Chamberlains ; and that at each of these sessions the payments made *since the previous session* were checked and recorded. Thus : at the session held on October 23 all individual payments made between October 9 and 22 were checked, and recorded in the account book under date October 23.¹ If this conjecture is correct it follows that the individual items recorded under date September 3, including the one to the Chamberlain's men, were really paid out between August 6 and September 2. This would mean that the tour in Kent and East Sussex took place in the month of August ; and would allow the company plenty of time to reach Bristol by mid-September.

* * * * *

While going through the Rye account books I found a few references to other theatrical companies that do not seem to have been noted by previous researchers. I give them below :

1. 1594-5 (probably in September 1594) :

Pd to Therle of Worsitors players

x^s

2. 1594-5 :

March 21 (1595) To the Queens Players

xx^s

¹ The fact that the dates are at *irregular* intervals, varying from a fortnight to a month, tends to bear out my conjecture that they refer to sessions of the municipal authorities. Had they been at *regular* intervals—e.g. the first of each month, or once every fortnight—it would have been more natural to adopt Murray's hypothesis, and suppose that the batch of items following any given date were paid *after*, and not *before*, that date.

3. 1595-6 (probably in September 1595):
Imprimis to the right ho: the Lo: of Worst: plyers for a rewarde
beinge here x^a
4. 1595-6:
April 24 (1596) Pd to her Maties Players as a rewarde to
them given of the Townshipp beinge here xx^a
5. 1596-7 (probably in March 1597):
Paid for a Pottle of wyne bestowed upon the Queenes
players at the assignment of Mr Maior xvj^d

I should like to take the opportunity of expressing my grateful thanks to the respective Town Clerks of Faversham, Rye and Dover not only for permitting me to examine the records under their charge but also for the very generous way in which they gave me their personal assistance in tracing the entries I was seeking.

B. M. WARD.

THE MARRIAGE OF EDWARD PHILLIPS AND ANNE MILTON

MASSON in his *Life of Milton* rightly regards the history of the Phillips family, with which the poet was intimately associated throughout his career, as relevant to his subject, and he gives at length such facts as can be gleaned from the statements of Edward Phillips, Jr., and other sources. Neither he, however, nor the writer of the articles on the Phillipses in the *Dictionary of National Biography* apparently had knowledge of the existence of a document¹ relating to the marriage of the elder Edward Phillips to Milton's sister, which, besides informing us as to the date of this event, supplies other details of considerable interest.

This document, drawn November 27, 1623, is in the form of a contract between Edward Phillips, Sr., and his mother, Katharine Phillips, parties of the first and second parts, and John Milton, Sr., and James Hodgkinson, parties of the third part. Its object is to secure to Anne Milton and her heirs the inheritance of the bulk of the real property of the Phillips family in place of the third to which she was entitled by common law. To this end the property is transferred to Milton and Hodgkinson, who agree to hold it in

¹ In the John Pierpont Morgan Library, New York. I am indebted to the authorities of the library for furnishing me with a transcript of the indenture.

trust for Katharine Phillips during her life, then for Edward and Anne Phillips or the longer liver, finally, for their heirs male successively, beginning with the eldest son. The estate is described as consisting of nine messuages or tenements in Shrewsbury, including a brewhouse and a tannery, and one in Caersow, Montgomery County. One of the Shrewsbury houses situated in Milk Street is said to be "now or late in the possession of Katharine Phillips." The agreement is witnessed by Anne Milton and John Milton, Jr., and by James Hodgkinson, Thomas Bower and John Hutton, "servants to the within named John Milton."

The marriage, which is mentioned in the indenture as solemnised or to be solemnised (the preceding words are illegible in the MS.), must certainly have taken place on the day of the signing of the marriage settlement, *i.e.* November 23, 1623. Masson's date, "toward the close of the year 1624," is purely conjectural. He assumed that Milton's *Poem on the Death of a Fair Infant*, Anne's and Edward's daughter, belonged to the winter of 1625-1626, and guessed that the child was born about a year after the marriage and died in the cradle.¹

We hear from Edwards Phillips, Jr., in his *Life of Milton*, that Anne Milton was given in marriage to his father, "with a considerable dower." The amount of this dower, in consideration of the payment of which the agreement between the Phillipses and the elder Milton was made, is mentioned in the indenture as £800 and upward. We have in the fact an additional indication of the substantial wealth of the Milton family. It is interesting to note that the poet Milton, then nearing the age of sixteen, was present at the occasion of his sister's marriage and was asked to witness the legal transaction, perhaps as a mere matter of sentiment and courtesy. The autograph is by many years the earliest that we have from his pen.

In attempting to estimate the extent of the Phillips fortune we must add to the dowry and to the messuages described a jointure also mentioned as "to be had, made and perfected for the said Anne." This would have been real property settled on Anne and not subject to the disposal of the trustees. It is evident that the family was really well off. The problem of what actually happened to the property transferred to Milton and Hodgkinson as trustees is an interesting one. Edward Phillips died in 1631. His will²

¹ Masson, *Life of Milton*, i, 103 ff. and 169 ff.

² *Ibid.*, ii, 98-99.

naturally makes no mention of real estate in Shrewsbury or elsewhere, for this had passed out of his ownership. It would now, according to the terms of the trust, be administered for the benefit of Anne. She married a certain Thomas Agar,¹ probably before the year 1637, and predeceased him before 1671. Anne's eldest son, Edward Phillips, Jr., born 1630, would be next heir to the Phillips property. We find him, however, in comparative poverty in adult life,² one among other indications of his need being the fact that he is given a legacy of £200 in Agar's will³ (drawn June 10, 1671) "to be laid out in the purchase of an annuity for his life or some place of employment for his better subsistence." It appears, therefore, that the income from his ancestral property was no longer available to him. What happened is a matter of conjecture. The elder Milton and his fellow-trustee, Hodgkinson, were bound only in equity to adhere to the provisions laid down in the indenture of 1623. It seems plausible that when Anne married the prosperous Agar they determined, with her consent, to use the inheritance for the rearing of her two children by her first marriage. If so the arrangement must have involved John Milton, Jr. He undertook the education of the boys, Edward, aged 9, and John, aged 8, immediately upon his return from Italy, while he was still located in lodgings in St. Bride's Churchyard. (The younger, according to Edward Phillips' statement, had been "wholly committed to his charge and care.") But within a year he took "a good handsome house" in Aldersgate Street, and boarded both Edward and John. In the spring of 1647, Milton, who was by that time married and living in the Barbican, expanded his school, but on the death of his father in the same year he moved to a smaller house in Holborn, where according to Masson he "either ceased to teach altogether or had no pupils remaining but his two nephews." How long they both continued to live with him is not known. Edward went to the University in 1650. John became assistant secretary to his uncle in 1651. It would be interesting to know definitely whether Milton succeeded his father in the trusteeship of the Phillips estate and to what extent he was himself in the period from 1640 to 1650 financed by it.

JAMES H. HANFORD.

¹ Masson, vi, 637 ff.

² Such is the general impression left by Masson's account of his career as tutor, vi, pp. 763 ff. Wood reports him as writing and translating "merely to get a bare livelihood" in 1684 and 1685.

³ Masson, vi, 772-73.

THE COLUMBIA EDITION OF MILTON

PROFESSOR SAURAT's sympathetic review of the long-expected Columbia *Milton* is misleading in one important respect.

Professor Saurat writes that he has failed to discover any defects on a first contact with the volumes. Readers interested in Milton's text will tell a different tale. The Columbia editors' handling of the textual matter falls far short of reasonable expectation. They define their procedure thus: "The text is based on the latest edition published in Milton's lifetime. . . . The original punctuation and spelling are followed except in the case of obvious misprints. In the notes the several editors attempt to furnish full textual information, including all variations in spelling, punctuation and the use of italics to be found in the texts published before 1674." A defensible method and a laudable aim, but the exacting reader—and Milton breeds exacting readers—will complain of too many miscarriages.

Here are a few, encountered on a cursory inspection of the Columbia text of *Paradise Lost*.

(1) Obvious misprints in the second edition retained :

- e.g. I, 407. *Aroar* for *Aroer* (First edition)
 IX, 1092, *from* for *for* (First edition)
 IX, 1093, *for* for *from* (First edition)
 I, 530, *fanting* for *fainting* (*fainted*, First edition)

(2) The printed text followed where the MS. gives the right reading. In the following places Columbia does not even record the MS. reading (the first three setting the word right, the last three the punctuation) :

- I, 71, *those* where MS. reads *these*
 I, 432, *those* where MS. reads *these*
 I, 756, *Capital* where MS. reads originally *Capitoll*.
 I, 15, *Mount*, where MS. reads *Mount* ;
 I, 97, *lustre* ; where MS. reads *lustre*,
 I, 133, *Fate*, where MS. reads *fate* ;

(3) Significant readings of the first edition omitted in the textual apparatus :

- e.g. II, 506. *Counsel* (Second edition) in Columbia text, but *Council* (First edition) Milton's deliberate spelling omitted in the apparatus.

VII, 63, *conspicuous* (Second edition) in the text, but *conspicuous* (First edition) omitted in the apparatus.

VII, 109, *Illustrious* (Second edition) in the text, but *illustrious* (First edition) a possible reading, omitted in the apparatus.

These omissions are not compensated by a load of readings from the posthumous edition, 1680, of *Paradise Regain'd*, nearly all of which are devoid of any significance or importance whatever.

A further defect is the failure to record the few important emendations which scholars have supplied to Milton's nearly faultless text. No edition that pretends to completeness should omit Bentley's *soul* for *Foul*, VII, 451, and *swelling* for *smelling*, VII, 321.

The student of Milton who seeks first aid in a textual difficulty, along with the experienced scholar who needs all the help he can get, will still turn thankfully to the cheap, handy, excellent Cambridge edition by Aldis Wright. Perhaps the truth is that for textual work one expert scholar is better than a team.

HELEN DARBISHIRE.

NOTE ON GEORGE SAVILE, FIRST MARQUESS OF HALIFAX

IN her book *The Life and Letters of Sir G. Savile*, 1898, Miss H. C. Foxcroft laments the fact that in all the papers which she has gone through there is no single entry which throws light upon the personal history of Sir George Savile between the years 1644 and 1654. While examining, in the British Museum, the private correspondence of Sir Richard Browne, father-in-law to John Evelyn, and agent for Charles I and Charles II in Paris from 1641-1657, I found the following, in a letter addressed to Sir Richard by Sir Thomas Hanmer. It is dated from Angiers (*sic*), December 4, 1647.

Wee passe the tyme but indifferently well here though wee want not good wine and victualls, finding not such conversation as yours, S^r W^m Davenants and M^r Cowleys, yet wee haue the comfort of some of our countrey men as M^r Couentry, Doctor Duncombe¹ (a very honest man certainly) S^r Richard Percy, and some of the yonger straine as S^r George Sauile, S^r John Armytage, and others. (Add. MS. 15858. f. 11.)

¹ Eleazar Duncon, late Prebend of Durham, who sometimes officiated in the Resident's Chapel in Paris.

Savile at this time was fourteen. It is interesting to find him at Angers in the company of William Coventry, younger son of the Lord Keeper, and as Miss Foxcroft says, the kinsman by whom all through his life Savile was most strongly influenced. Clarendon (*Life*, vol. i, par. 401) mentions that Coventry was in France at this time.

The Gentleman was young whilst the war continued : yet he had put himself before the end of it into the army and had the command of a foot company, and shortly after travelled into France : where he remained whilst there was any hope of getting another army for the king or that either of the other cranks would engage in his quarrel. But when all thoughts of that were desperate, he returned into England ; where he remained for many years without the least correspondence with any of his friends beyond the seas. . . .

What Savile was doing at Angers it is difficult to say. He may have been starting on the Grand Tour, though for that he would have been rather young ; or he may have come over to France to do his "exercises"—fencing, dancing, etc., in Paris. He was surely too young to have been concerned in Coventry's Royalist schemes ?

E. E. PHARE.

A NOTE ON MANUSCRIPT VARIANTS NOT COLLATED IN A. R. WALLER'S EDITION OF PRIOR

THE text of the majority of Prior's poems was for all purposes settled by the poet himself in the great folio edition of 1718, but for those early poems which were "prudently disowned" and not reprinted, and those written after 1718, a similar authority is lacking. The following notes may therefore be worth recording. Among the poems omitted in the 1718 collection is the piece on p. 302 of Waller's *Dialogues of the Dead*, "To a Friend on His Marriage." A manuscript of this poem, apparently unknown to Waller (since he gives details of such other manuscripts as he collated there), is in the British Museum, Add. 7121. f. 45. Beyond the differences of mere spelling or capitals it varies in several details from Waller's text. In the first place the title reads, more explicitly, "To Mr Charles Montagu, on his Marriage with the Right Hon.^{ble} the Countess of Manchester," and so explains the affectionate diminutive *Chamont* with which the verses open. For p. 302, l. 11 the manuscript reads *joy* for *Bliss* and *must* for *will* in l. 20. Lines 25-28

are not crossed through as in the Longleat MS. or bracketed as in Waller, because, contrary to the editor's belief, they are evidently an integral part of the poem, which ends with the subscription "I wish you Joy and am Dear S:^r Yo:^r most obliged and obedient Ser:^t Mat: Prior."

An earlier poem (Waller, p. 289) *Advice to the Painter*, is to be found in MS. Sloane 655, ff. 26 *et seq.* with the following readings not in Waller: for the title read "Advice to a Painter"; for *direful*, p. 289, l. 32, read *dreadful*; for *large-ear'd*, l. 35, read *long-ear'd*; for *A Romantick Constancy*, l. 35, read *the old Roman constancy*; for *horrid*, p. 291, l. 7, read *rebell*, and for *comes*, l. 29, read *was*; for *show*, l. 4, read *tell*; for p. 292, l. 5, read *This Tragedys last Act the fatall blow*; for *Prelate*, l. 12, read *Prelates*; for *confound*, l. 13, read *depress*; for *writ*, l. 16, read *wrote*.

The manuscript of *A Satire on Modern Translators* (Sloane 655, ff. 10-13) differs from Waller only in minor details: for *the Spark*, p. 48, l. 6, it reads *a Spark*; for *other would*, l. 16, it reads *tother could*; for *Ally*, l. 30, *Alleys*; for *would*, l. 39, it reads *could*, and for l. 7, p. 51, the order is changed to *Had not the first with Cuts the Town appeased*. A few marginal notes wanting in Waller are added: to p. 48, last line, the gloss is *In his translation of the 4th Bk of Lucretius*; to p. 49, l. 12, *His prologue to Troilus and Cressida taken by Shakespeare's ghost*; to p. 50, l. 9, *In his trans. of Ovid. El. 1 line 3*; and to l. 25, *His first work the translation of Lucretius*.

W. P. BARRETT.

HENRY CAREY'S BETTY

ON December 1, 1732, was performed at Drury Lane Theatre a ballad-opera entitled *Betty, or the Country Bumpkins*. The author seems to have been Henry Carey,¹ already well-known for the ballad of *Sally in Our Alley* and a few trivial dramatic pieces, and later to become famous for the burlesque tragedy *Chrononhotonthologos*. The play was never printed, either separately or in the complete *Dramatick Works* of Carey which appeared in 1743, but on the night of performance a sheet containing the words of all the songs

¹ It is attributed to him by Whincop, Victor (*History of the Theatres of London and Dublin*), and the *Biographia Dramatica*, though all three date it wrongly; the first two say that it was acted in 1739, and the last in 1738. Press advertisements, however, show that the date was 1732.

was distributed gratis in the theatre, and a copy is preserved in the British Museum. Beyond this all trace of the piece has disappeared.

In every bibliography of Carey's works—from that given in Whincop's *List of the English Dramatick Poets* (1747) to the article in the *Dictionary of National Biography*—Betty is entered as a distinct and separate item; yet there seems reason to believe that actually it was no more than an adaptation of a farce, written by the same author some years before (in 1722, to be precise) under the title of *Hanging and Marriage*. The scene of this piece is set in a little country village, and all the characters speak in dialect. Richard Stubble, in love with Betty, the daughter of Gaffer Gizzard, has been rejected for Solomon Squeak, the parish clerk. Jealousy between the two men soon leads to blows. In a frenzy of rage Richard pretends to hang himself, leaving a note which commands Betty to marry his dead body before it is put in the grave, on pain of being carried to the devil by his ghost. Fearing that such a thing may happen, the girl complies, when the "corpse" suddenly arises and claims Betty as its lawful bride.

This outline of the plot of the earlier play has been given because a knowledge of it is necessary to follow the argument which ensues. It appears from the songs that the names of the two principal characters of *The Country Bumpkins* were Betty and Richard, while it is also noticeable that each of these lyrics would be exactly appropriate to the several successive episodes of *Hanging and Marriage*. The sixth song, for instance, which would come near the beginning of the performance, is in the form of a dialogue between Richard and Betty.

Betty : Audacious intruder !
If thus you grow ruder,
I'll raise all the house.

Richard : And where's the man shall curb me ?
If any disturb me,
I'll hash him as small as a mouse.

Now this might very well have formed part of the scene, near the opening of the play, in which Betty tries, unsuccessfully, to compose the quarrel between Richard and Squeak, while two later airs (XVII and XVIII) suggest that the plot was connected in some way or other with hanging and suicide.

Air XVII

None but an Ass
 For a humoursome lass,
 Would hang himself up in a string, boys ;
 If she's unkind,
 All her scorn never mind,
 But merrily whistle and sing, boys !

Air XVIII

My dear, I'll not bid thee farewell,
 Come, gravedigger, quick, with thy spade ;
 Go, sexton, and ring out my knell,
 For both in one grave shall be laid.

The former of these seems appropriate to the "hanging" episode, and the latter to the discovery of the body by Betty. Not without significance is a press advertisement, in the *Daily Post* for Tuesday, December 6, 1732, of the first performance of the piece, from which it appears that the characters were practically identical with those in the earlier *Hanging and Marriage*. Let us put the two side by side and compare them. The *dramatis personæ* of *Hanging and Marriage* are Goodman Gizzard, Richard Stubble, Solomon Squeak, Jerry, Mazzard, Sprangle, Two Countrymen, Mother Stubble, and Betty Gizzard. The advertisement of *Betty* specifies Betty, Jenny, Richard, Gizzard, Wrangle, Goody Stubble, Goody Grover, Huntsmen, Countrymen and Lasses. Of both plays, then, Betty is the heroine. The Richard of *Betty* is presumably the Richard Stubble of the earlier play, while Goody Stubble obviously corresponds to Mother Stubble of *Hanging and Marriage*. Goodman Gizzard appears in both pieces, and Wrangle is probably the earlier Solomon Squeak. As for the sub-title of *Betty*, that would be equally appropriate to *Hanging and Marriage*, for the characters are certainly country bumpkins. In both plays, then, the characters are almost identical, the titles of the two could easily be interchanged, and the songs indicate that in both the main incidents of the plot were the same. There seem, then, good grounds for believing that the ballad opera *Betty* was a re-worked version of Carey's earlier farce, *Hanging and Marriage*.

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

RICHARDSON'S EARLY YEARS AS A PRINTER

OUR knowledge of Samuel Richardson's early career is so scanty that details trivial in themselves may be of considerable help in piecing out the record. These notes are concerned particularly with the obscure period from June 13, 1715, when he became a freeman of the Stationers' Company, to 1725, when he had been established for some time as a master printer in Salisbury Court, Fleet Street. After spending some years as corrector and overseer in the printing-office of his master, John Wilde, he set up for himself, probably about 1719, in an obscure court off Fleet Street. The entry of his marriage to Martha Wilde in Charterhouse Chapel, November 23, 1721, describes him as of St. Bride's Parish, and this is the first known record of his life-long association with the Fleet Street neighbourhood. Meanwhile, John Wilde had died in January 1720, and his printing business in Aldersgate Street passed to his son Allington. The business connection with Allington Wilde may have been of some importance to Richardson; both men seem to have started on about the same footing, and both were admitted on the livery of the Stationers' Company at the same time, March 5, 1721-1722.¹ Apparently Wilde never became prominent in the trade; his imprint is found on various editions of *Pilgrim's Progress* and on almanacs issued for the Stationers' Company.

An interesting piece of evidence shows that Richardson was already connected at this time with another printing family, the Leakes, to whom he turned ten years later for a second wife. M. Dottin, writing of his second marriage in 1732, remarks that he had long been intimate with a printer named John Leake, and may have worked for him as a journeyman.² The last is pure conjecture, and Dottin writes as if John Leake were still alive in 1732, but the suggestion that Richardson's friendship with the Leakes was of long standing is important, and deserves documentary support. Mr. Reade gives the records of the Leake family from the registers of St. Botolph's, Aldersgate, up to the year 1707.³ John Leake,

¹ Stationers' Company, Court Book H, p. 109. For all extracts from these records I am indebted to the courtesy of the Company. In the case of Wilde the date of admission has been given as March 5, 1721 (Aleyn Lyell Reade, *Notes and Queries*, 12 S., xi, 182), and in the case of Richardson it has never been given at all, simply because it was not copied into the separate record of apprentices bound, free, and clothed.

² *Samuel Richardson* (Paris, 1931), p. 31.

³ *Notes and Queries*, 12 S., xi, 224.

who had begun business long before in partnership with his father at the Crown, Fleet Street, had lived in Jewin Street for some time, but in the first decade of the eighteenth century he moved his business to Old Change, and the family records thereafter appear in the registers of St. Michael le Quern and St. Vedast. John Leake himself died in February 1720,¹ and the business thereupon passed to his widow, Elizabeth Leake. Meanwhile their son James had completed his apprenticeship to W. Freeman, and, as was often the case in the trade, had set up in business for himself instead of joining his father. We first find him, probably in partnership with James Hazard, in Stationers' Court,² then in Salisbury Court,³ and a little later at Bath, where he eventually became one of the most famous booksellers of the day.⁴ In April 1721, Elizabeth Leake died, and her share in the English stock of the Stationers' Company passed to her son.⁵ With James Leake's removal to Bath there was apparently no member of the family left in London to conduct the business, although there may have been some attempt to carry it on by deputy in the latter half of 1721 and the early months of 1722. Samuel Richardson may have stepped into the breach during that time. At any rate he took over part of the business in the summer of 1722, for we find the following transfer of apprentices on August 6:

Turn'd over

George Mitchell Appr to John Leake	} to Samuel Richardson ⁶
Joseph Crichley App ^r to Eliz ^a Leake	
Tho. Gover App. to James Leake	

This transaction probably indicates a considerable enlargement of Richardson's business, and may mean that he was taking over not only apprentices, but also good will, plant and premises.

¹ *Registers of St. Michael le Quern, Harleian Soc. Registers*, xxx (1903), 345.

² *Weekly Packet*, November 28–December 5, 1719; *Daily Post*, March 15, 1720; May 5, 1720.

³ Stationers' Company, Court Book H, p. 78, October 3, 1720.

⁴ On April 23, 1721, he married Hannah Hammond, daughter of Henry Hammond, bookseller (*Registers of Bath Abbey, Harleian Soc. Registers*, xxvii [1900], 234). By February 1722, he was established in business at Bath.

⁵ *Registers of St. Vedast, Harleian Soc. Registers*, xxx (1903), 270. Stationers' Company, Court Book H, p. 93.

⁶ Court Book H, p. 121. George Mitchell was apprenticed to John Leake on April 6, 1719 (*ibid.*, p. 48); Joseph Chrichley [*sic*] was apprenticed to Elizabeth Leake on August 1, 1720 (*ibid.* p. 76); Thomas Gover was apprenticed to James Leake on October 3, 1720 (*ibid.* p. 78). Joseph Chrichley [*sic*] afterwards carried on a printing business at Charing Cross.

It is a tempting conjecture that James Leake's short sojourn in Salisbury Court in 1720 may have had something to do with Samuel Richardson's establishing himself there a little later. There were several printers in a small way of business in Salisbury Court at this time, however—among them John Pickard, John Senex, John Crook, Nicholas Blanford, and George Parker—and Richardson probably had dealings with them of which there is no record. At some time between 1720 and 1722 Senex moved from the Court to Fleet Street. Mr. Burns Martin has recently called attention to an advertisement in the *Weekly Journal, or Saturday's Post*, January 11, 1724, which shows that Richardson was in the Court by the end of 1723.¹ The rate-books of St. Bride's parish enable us to locate his premises pretty definitely.² In 1724 he occupied a modest establishment between Blue-Ball Court (later Bell's Buildings) and Half-Paved Court, in the south-east corner of Salisbury Square. John Strype's description of "Dorset Court, commonly called Salisbury Court," one of the additions to the 1720 edition of Stow's *Survey*, gives us an accurate idea of the neighbourhood :

This Street on the West side, passing down to the *Thames*, is a handsome, airy, open Square, all taken up with good Buildings, the best inhabited of any in the Court : For that part towards the *Thames*, as also the Wilderness, with the small Courts, are not to be much boasted of. In this Place are these Courts and Places of Name : *Viz. Blue Ball Court*, an indifferent good Place, with a Freestone Pavement. *Half paved Court*, but ordinary, etc.³

Richardson evidently began on the humbler side of the street. In Cunningham's *London* we read :

Richardson's first home and printing office was in the middle of the square. Later on he moved to No. 11, and in 1755 he pulled down a number of old houses on the east side of the square in what was then known as Blue Ball Court (afterwards occupied by Bell's Buildings), where he built himself extensive printing-works.⁴

But as Dobson points out, the enlargements of 1755 were in the north-west corner of Salisbury Square, and extended along White Lion Court toward Fleet Street. We now see that Cunningham is correct in saying that Richardson was once established on the eastern side of the square, but he mistakes the order in which Richardson

¹ *Modern Language Notes*, xlv (1930), 469.

² Guildhall MS. 78, fols. 17, 51, 85, 109.

³ iii, 279.

⁴ London, 1927, p. 631.

occupied the various premises. We must assume a removal, certainly before 1747-1748, when the rate-books show that he was already in the north-west corner,¹ and probably before 1743, when, according to the distressed Laetitia Pilkington, he occupied a house of "very grand outward appearance" in Salisbury Court.²

Of the earliest years of Richardson's business at least one trace remains in the imprint of a volume called *Poems on Several Occasions*, published anonymously by the Rev. Jonathan Smedley, Dean of Killala—"London: Printed by S. Richardson, for the Author. MDCCXXI." The early date and the hint of literary associations are remarkable. The copy in the Harvard College Library is of considerable association interest; it is inscribed "Anna Maria Owen Her Book Given by M^{rs} Eliz: Leake January the 7th 17³⁰/₃₁." A few weeks later Martha Richardson died, and in 1732 Elizabeth Leake became the second wife of Samuel Richardson. Anna Maria Owen was herself a life-long friend of the second Mrs. Richardson, and is mentioned in her will.³

The early biographical sketches say nothing about Smedley, but always mention a tradition that Richardson was concerned in the printing of the Duke of Wharton's *True Briton* (1723). It is likely enough that Richardson had some dealings with Wharton at this time. The Duke was cultivating the suffrages of the City, and had enrolled himself a member of the Wax Chandlers' Company to increase his popularity. He supported Sir John Williams for Sheriff in the summer of 1723 and the spring of 1724, and we discover from the polling lists that Richardson voted for Wharton's candidate.⁴

His connection with the Wharton faction no doubt explains his being grouped among the "High Fliers" in Negus's list of London printers issued in 1724.⁵ As appears from his vote in the aldermanic elections of 1727, he continued for some years at least to sympathise with the opposition.⁶

ALAN D. MCKILLOP.

¹ Guildhall MS. 79, fol. 33.

² *Memoirs* (repr. London, 1928), p. 282.

³ *Notes and Queries*, 12 S., xi, 427.

⁴ *Daily Journal*, March 20, 1724. See also the poll in the parliamentary elections (*Daily Post*, December 7, 1724).

⁵ See Nichols, *Lit. Anec.* i (1812), 288-312.

⁶ *Daily Journal*, October 31.

"INOCULATION, HEAVENLY MAID ! DESCEND !"

IN Chapter XVIII of the *Biographia Literaria* Coleridge remarks that certain poems in Dodsley's collection "seldom fail to remind me of an Oxford copy of verses on the two Suttons, commencing with

INOCULATION, heavenly maid ! descend !"

None of the editors gives the source of the quotation. The point is, in itself, of small importance, but so much enlightenment has been gained by the microscopic examination of books known to have passed through Coleridge's hands that it is desirable to have the list as nearly as possible complete.

In this instance the direction of the search is suggested by a volume entitled "Oxford Prize Poems," published in 1807. One of the constituent poems is *Beneficial Effects of Inoculation*, by William Lipscomb, of Corpus Christi. This, on examination, proves disappointing, for there is no mention of a "heavenly maid" and the word *inoculation* occurs only in the title and once in a footnote, where it supplies a very necessary clue to the author's meaning. But in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for October 1783 there appears an earlier and longer version, in which these lines occur :

INOCULATION, heaven-instructed maid,
She woo'd from Turkey's shores to Britain's aid.¹

It is a reasonable conjecture that this was the couplet vaguely present to Coleridge's mind, for it is not to be expected that he should quote accurately at the time of writing the *Biographia*. He is correct in speaking of the poem as "an Oxford copy of verses," for it is stated in an editorial note : "The above elegant poem was honoured with the Chancellor's prize in 177—." ²

The brothers Sutton, to whom Coleridge refers, are not mentioned by name, but it will be remembered that they had achieved a great reputation about 1770 by improving and simplifying the process of inoculation.³ Coleridge may be supposed to identify the leading practitioners of the art with the art itself.

P. L. CARVER.

¹ *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. 53, p. 869. The "she" of the couplet is Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. The poet therefore did not actually commit the absurdity of personifying inoculation as a heavenly maid.

² The exact date is 1772. See *Oxford Prize Poems* (1807), p. 26.

³ See Mr. George Sampson's note on "the two Suttons" in his edition of the *Biographia Literaria*, p. 310.

REVIEWS

The New Shakespeare : The Comedies. Edited by Sir ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH and JOHN DOVER WILSON. Cambridge University Press. 14 volumes, 6s. net each.

It is impossible to do justice to the labours of the new Cambridge editors in a short review. It seems, therefore, better to touch on points connected with some one important critical question that their work has raised, than merely to describe in turn the features of this well known edition. It is an attempt to advance both the literary and textual criticism of the plays, on the literary side by new considerations drawn from the study of Shakespeare's plays as examples of dramatic workmanship, on the textual side by the application of the bibliographical principles that have recently proved so helpful in solving a number of Shakespearian problems. The first part of the task has fallen primarily to Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, but considerations springing from Professor Dover Wilson's textual studies are also often involved in it, the *Note on the Copy* for any particular play being usually the bridge between the literary and textual side of the edition. This part of their work has attracted much attention, especially those conclusions tending towards the disintegration, as it has been called, of the text. "In the eyes of some critics," Professor Dover Wilson has protested, "this seems to constitute the most important, if not the only significant feature of the edition" (M.L.R., XXV, 4). There remains the purely textual part of the work, and here the question presents itself, How far has the textual editor been able to adapt the suggestions of the bibliographers to his business of criticism and reconstruction?

As long as editors were persuaded that between the printed pages of the early Quartos or First Folio and Shakespeare's manuscripts there stretched a long chain of interpolated transcripts, there was little hope of reducing the habits of such a host of scribes to any system with which one might become familiar; and the vital questions of the genealogy and affiliation of the various versions

could admit of no more than a wide solution. Yet the critic wishes to be able to say of the very defects that hinder the full communication of his author's sense,

But I of these will wrest an Alphabet
And by still practice learn to know thy meaning,

and to guard against citing as independent witnesses for his text "those who merely repeat what they have heard from others." The early editors, though they made many fine corrections, left much to be done towards a systematic treatment of the textual problem as a whole. But when Professor Pollard showed beyond reasonable doubt that some at least of the early Quartos were set up directly from manuscripts in Shakespeare's own handwriting, and that the words of Heminge and Condell about "his papers" must be taken seriously, he animated textual students with a new hope: no point can be too minute for investigation, no labour too long to undertake where there is the chance of understanding not merely the habits of the copyists but of Shakespeare's own hand and its reactions in the printed version of those who worked from his manuscripts; and the conflicting witnesses can now be examined in the light of this knowledge more rigorously with some hope of determining their respective authorities.

Professor Dover Wilson set himself to show that these hopes were justified, and he has in certain of his investigations been rewarded with the happiest results. The point that it was Shakespeare and not his printer who spelt the name of the Justice in *Henry IV* as *Scilens*, and that the writer of the D hand in *Sir Thomas More* also used this spelling has caught the imagination of more than textual students; and this is only one of many similar observations. How has Professor Dover Wilson given expression to these theories in the wider field of Recension and Emendation?

Professor Dover Wilson in a *Retrospect* (M.L.R., XXV, 4), glancing over the history and aims of thirteen of these volumes, has summarised as follows the principles governing his recension:

It is a cardinal principle of the edition that the text it presents is, where two or more (Quarto or Folio) versions exist, the result not of collation but of selection, *i.e.* of a decision as to which of the available versions is the most authoritative.

"Such a choice," he continues, "involves a close examination and analysis of *all* the contemporary editions," and he seems to imply

that such an examination will always make the selection he speaks of possible. Professor Dover Wilson wishes to satisfy the demand for consistency he finds in the last chapter of *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates* :

the readings of any edition of a play of Shakespeare's subsequent to the First duly registered Quarto cannot have any shred of authority, unless a reasonably probable case can be made out for access having been obtained to a new manuscript or its equivalent. And to construct such a case all the variants in the edition must be brought together and considered as a whole.

Professor Pollard censures Capell among others for picking out from the early editions, other than the first, readings that seemed to him "to improve the Author"; he denies "his right to correct original editions by others that were merely old," and rejects "the specious suggestion that the fact of a new reading being (in editorial eyes) an improvement carried with it a presumption of genuineness." And he concludes: "As bibliographers we must protest that it is not mere age, but proof of independent access to a source, that gives an edition authority."

Professor Pollard's meaning is clear and indisputable; but in turning to his task, which is not a purely bibliographical one, the editor of Shakespeare must ask what stronger evidence of independent access to a source any primary Shakespeare text can show him than the excellence of its readings. How, for example, does he know a good Quarto from a bad one? The Stationers' Register, the statements of title-pages are no infallible guides. In distinguishing between texts as well as between readings his judgment of what is excellent, or at least characteristic of Shakespeare, is required. If by "improvement" we understand Capell to mean a reading more fitting in the context and more proper to the genius of the author than that which it displaces, much may be said for his criterion, however mistaken he may have been in its application. And Professor Pollard provides a useful illustration of how criticism cannot be subordinated to purely bibliographical considerations. In *Richard II*, I, ii, 70, Q2 reads "heare." For many years the known copies of Q1 gave "cheere." The critical sagacity, however, of those who took "heare" as the true reading was at length vindicated by the discovery of a first Quarto with this reading. But till this discovery was made it would have been easy to point out that Q2 was a reprint and that its variants lacked authority. Each

variant is an individual problem, and though it must be considered in the light of the *variants considered as a whole*, this whole cannot be correctly computed till the individual's particular contribution to this total is correctly assessed.

A single reading may by its own excellence hold out against the trend of the other evidence. The second Quarto (1630) of *Othello* is generally regarded as an independent witness to the text of the play. Clark and Wright and also Evans agree that, while Q2 was printed from Q1, the additions and corrections are *derived from an independent source* not the Folio. Of the compiler of Q2 Evans says, "all evidence is against his having collated his edition with the Folio," but he proved on pp. xii-xiii of his Introduction to Q1, without knowing it, that the compiler did use the Folio. The only evidence of independent access to a source Clark and Wright give consists of six readings (four in passages not found in Q1) they select from Q2. None is beyond the wit of the compiler except this :

F. the Ponticke Sea . . .
Neu'r keepes retyring ebbe, but keepes due on
To the Proponenticke.

Q2 Ne'r feels retiring ebbe, but keepes due on.

The character of this reading, though everything else pointed the other way, would by itself prove that, here at least, the compiler had access, even if only orally, to an independent source.

The textual critic who is held by scholars to be the greatest living master in this art has put these considerations in the clearest light. Illustrating his point from the text of Juvenal, Professor Housman has said :

Whether P is the best MS of Juvenal, and to what extent, can only be settled by considering on its intrinsic merits every discrepancy between P and the other MSS. If, while we are engaged in so considering one of these discrepancies, you interrupt us with the assertion, possibly quite true, that P is the best MS and far the best, we shall reply : "That is the question which we are now investigating at a preliminary stage. When we have made up our minds about this passage, then we will add it either to the evidence in favour of P or else to the evidence in favour of *Ψ*. To warp our choice in this particular instance by assuming as proved the general conclusion for which we are now collecting materials is, in the full sense of the term, preposterous."

It is true that Shakespeare's original is much nearer us than that of Juvenal ; but when Shakespeare's text is concerned

bibliography can only build on a critical basis. We cannot argue that it is scientific and systematic and that it must therefore overrule the findings of criticism, which are often erroneous. If criticism is not to be trusted, then the foundation on which the bibliographical structure has been built is also taken away.

All this Professor Dover Wilson recognises, at times, in his practice. In *Love's Labour's Lost* he does not hesitate to adopt a Folio reading that commends itself to his judgment though the Quarto is the basis he is working on. It is true he supports his choice with the suggestion that the Folio was printed from a more correct Quarto than any we now possess, but this suggestion depends on his choice, not his choice on it. Sometimes, however, in his anxiety to adhere to his selected text he brushes aside relevant considerations that point the other way. In *Much Ado*, III, iii, 77, Q1 reads "statutes," F "statues." Professor Dover Wilson selects "statutes" because, though "statues" is, in his opinion, very much in the manner of Dogberry, the change in the Folio, involving the loss of a letter, is the sort of error he finds in dozens of other Folio corruptions. It would be "unscientific" he argues to take this one reading from the Folio and reject the others. But he has accepted certain *obvious* corrections in the Folio, which drop a letter from the corresponding Q readings. And he cannot suppose that every superfluous letter in the Quarto will signal its presence by making of the word where it intrudes mere nonsense, or that only where the Q gives impossible readings does it give false readings. If this were so, recension would be a mechanical occupation. Now the change from "statues" to "statutes" might well be made by a compositor delighted at his discovery of the meaning of the passage. The F2 compositor or corrector certainly changed F1 "statues" back again to "statutes," and it is not proved he had the first Quarto before him. Such considerations, whatever weight is to be given to them, cannot be set aside for purely bibliographical reasons.

It is clear that when all the variants are correctly weighed a clean-cut choice between the rival texts will not always be possible. One may be better than another and much better without permitting us to dispense with the other. It has already been indicated that Professor Dover Wilson is not so absolute in practice as in theory, and a final illustration of this divergence may be taken from a piece of work which, though outside the Comedies, shows in short compass

the methods employed on them. His text of *Hamlet* is announced as edited from the Second Quarto. It is known that certain passages have, however, to be made good from the Folio, for they were omitted in error by the printer of Q2. Without having seen the new text¹ one may venture to say that the editor has not failed to avail himself of the help of the First Folio. The statement that his text is edited from Q2 is, like his summary of his principles of recension, inspired by a desire for bibliographical consistency, but it opens the way for the error against which Professor Housman has warned us :

the fashion of leaning on one manuscript like Hope on her anchor and trusting to heaven that no harm will come of it.

Professor Dover Wilson has, indeed, emphasised the importance of *Hamlet* Q2 to avoid the careless use some editors make of the Folio, in accepting what are often the unsatisfactory guesses in F1 instead of extricating the true reading from the corruption in Q2. But neither here nor in the summary of his principles of recension does his statement do justice to his intentions.

If, in the sphere of Recension, Professor Dover Wilson seems to have attempted, in theory at least, to simplify the process overmuch by suggesting that bibliographical considerations will take us further than they actually do or can, he has in considering the business of Emendation stressed even more heavily the palæographical as opposed to the critical aspect.

"The palæographical method," says Professor Housman, "has always been the delight of tiros and the scorn of critics. Haupt, for example, used to warn his pupils against mistaking this sort of thing for emendation. 'The prime requisite of a good emendation,' said he, 'is that it should start from the thought; it is only afterwards that other considerations, such as those of metre, or possibilities, such as the interchange of letters, are taken into account'. . . . And further: 'Some people, if they see that anything in an ancient text wants correcting, immediately betake themselves to the art of palæography, investigate the shapes of letters and the forms of abbreviation, and try one dodge after another, as if it were a game, until they hit upon something which they think they can substitute for the corruption; as if forsooth

¹ The writer has tried unfortunately without success to borrow a copy of this expensive work; he knows its features, therefore, only from reviews and the editor's other work on *Hamlet*.

truth were generally discovered by shots of that sort, or as if emendation could take its rise from anything but a careful consideration of the thought.' "

Professor Dover Wilson has been so preoccupied with the new material demanding his attention that he has allowed such precepts to slip from his memory. The nexus between the palæographical and critical aspect may be very different in a Shakespearian text from that in the manuscript of a classical author; for one thing the printer introduces a new factor; but however the balance is struck by the critic, the critical pole must remain the positive one. Here is the attraction that sifts like a magnet from the pile of worthless possibilities the valuable metal, and extracts if need be the needle from the haystack. The real importance of Professor Dover Wilson's work in this sphere is apt therefore to be obscured by an emphasis that does not show the true part such considerations may play in emendation.

If the corruption proves a stubborn one, other classes of misprint must be brought to bear upon the problem, and various combinations of letters tried. Finally, the results of this application of the principle of the *ductus litterarum* must be put to the literary test, by reference to the context, and by the aid of the *New English Dictionary*, which will supply, or withhold, contemporary support for the suggested reading. But the literary criterion, though of course essential, should not be brought in until the last stage, when bibliography and palæography have done their work. The basis of the whole business, in short, is the handwriting of Shakespeare. (Textual Introduction, pp. xlii-xliii.)

The value of technical considerations as a kind of fuel to the critic's inspiration cannot be too strongly stressed. But what Professor Housman says of the relative importance of technical considerations in the emendation of classical authors is also true of their place in the correction of Shakespeare :

The merits essential to a correction are those without which it cannot be true, and closeness to the MSS is not one of them; the indispensable things are fitness to the context and propriety to the genius of the author. The question whether the error presumed was great or small is indeed a question to be asked, but it is the last question.

Fitness and propriety are not always obvious and we naturally, as Professor Housman reminds us, tend to stress what we think we can discern with the bodily eye. But a sign is not given us in textual criticism any more than in more important matters.

With handwriting and spelling goes punctuation, and Professor

Dover Wilson has emphasised this element in the text by devising a special set of marks to record what seems to him important in the original. But it is not clear whether we are to regard the instances relegated to the notes as errors or whether the editor has merely included in the text a selection of the more interesting and suggestive stops. And Professor Dover Wilson although he warns us that Shakespeare's punctuation is often ungrammatical tends to accept the grammatical interpretation when another is equally possible, and perhaps even preferable, on what may be called literary grounds. This tendency shows itself when he rejects even the possibility of any but a grammatical interpretation of this passage in *Hamlet*, Q2 :

in forme and moouing, how expresse and admirable in action, how like an Angell in apprehension, how like a God :

But the comma with inversion is regularly found in the most authoritative texts, grammatical stops, such as we need here after "admirable" and "Angell," being frequently omitted. Not only does Shakespeare use the "comma with inversion" in this way, he makes a similar use of the semicolon, colon, and full stop. A simple example of the colon with inversion is found a few lines later :

Seneca cannot be too heauy, nor *Plautus* too light for the lawe of writ, and the liberty : these are the only men.

Shakespeare has not troubled to indicate the grammatical pause after "light," but no editor can therefore take the following colon as a grammatical stop, though the Folio transcriber or editor seems to have done so. It is possible, of course, to dismiss this and similar stops with Sir Edmund Chambers as "palpable errors," but it can be paralleled in such primary texts as *Coriolanus* and *Romeo and Juliet* Q2. Till Sir Edmund Chambers explains away this evidence one must go on trying with Professor Dover Wilson to reduce it to order and intelligibility ; the criticism of Professor Dover Wilson's method that is suggested here is merely that it is too conservative. This works two ways.

He sometimes rejects the established interpretation of the editors to return to a strictly grammatical reading of the original stop. In *The Tempest*, IV, i, 91-99, the Folio gives :

Of her societie
Be not afraid : I met her deitie
Cutting the clouds towards *Paphos* : and her Son

Doue-drawn with her : here thought they to haue done
 Some wanton charme, vpon this Man and Maide,
 Whose vowes are, that no bed-right shall be paid
 Till *Hymens* Torch he lighted : but in vaine,
Marses hot minion is returnd againe,
 Her waspish headed sonne, has broke his arrowes. . . .

The meaning is : here thought they to have done some wanton charme, but in vaine. This is why they have returned to *Paphos*, and why Cupid has broken his arrows. The colon after "lighted" is of a very common type in Shakespearian texts coming after some interpolation in the direct line of thought, and does not separate the clause that follows from the preceding sentences. If these stops were grammatical this colon would have to change places with the comma after "vaine." But Professor Dover Wilson reads :

Till Hymen's torch be lighted : but in vain
 Mars's hot minion is returned again—
 Her waspish headed son has broke his arrows.

On the other hand he sometimes accepts a received interpretation based on a grammatical reading of the stops where another is perhaps preferable. In *Much Ado about Nothing*, III, ii, 126-28, the first Quarto gives :

Claudio. If I see anie thing to-night, why I should not marry her tomorrow in the congregation, where I should wed, there will I shame her.

This is in reply to the Bastard's remarks :

Meanes your Lordship to be married to-morrow ? . . . go but with me to-night you shall see her chamber window entered, euen the night before her wedding day, if you loue her, then to-morow wed her.

The emphasis on "to-night" and "to-morrow" in this justifies Capell's reading :

If I see any thing to-night, why I should not marry her : to-morrow in the congregation, where I should wed, there will I shame her.

And this reading of the original can be justified by a similar treatment of the stops elsewhere, which all editors feel bound to adopt.

A passage coming under neither of these heads but where the editor has accepted the current interpretation, though the punctuation suggests a way out, occurs at *Measure for Measure*, I, i, 2-8 :

Duke. Of Government, the properties to vnfold,
 Would seeme in me t' affect speech and discourse,
 Since I am put to know, that your own Science
 Exceedes (in that) the lists of all aduice
 My strength can give you : Then no more remains
 But that, to your sufficiency, as your worth is able,
 And let them worke :

Professor Dover Wilson accepts the opinion that something has been lost or cut out between "sufficiency" and "as." But the meaning is: your own Science exceeds (in knowledge of the properties of Government) all I can teach you; therefore no more remains to your sufficiency (as governor), since your worth fits you for the post, but what I have already mentioned, namely my strength—strength meaning "the full force or authority of" as Dr. Onions glosses it in some places. Thisleton pointed out the force of the comma after "that," which makes it here a demonstrative not a conjunction; he took it, however, as pointing to "Government." The interpretation now suggested requires us to see a slight play on the word "strength," but this is quite characteristic of Shakespeare.

In the interpretation of Shakespeare's punctuation, familiarity with the material found in the original texts is essential; but this material cannot be made intelligible and available as an instrument of criticism till criticism has first prepared it. In this work a grasp of Shakespeare's thought and idiom is the shaping force, so that here again the critical weapon once forged can never be turned to disable the hand that made it without losing its own virtue.

Professor Pollard has brought Shakespearian criticism to the point reached by classical scholarship in the nineteenth century. "Till 1800 and later," says Professor Housman,

"no attempt was made by scholars to determine the genealogy and affiliation of MSS: science and method, applied to this end by the generation of Bekker and Lachmann, Madvig and Cobet, have cast hundreds of MSS, once deemed authorities, on the dust-heap, have narrowed the circle of witnesses by excluding those who merely repeat what they have heard from others, and have proved that the text of certain authors reposes on a single document from which all other extant MSS are copied."

But there now arose a desire to make all investigations conform to this pattern, and critical considerations were neglected in the haste to arrive at a similar satisfactory conclusion. The Shakespearian critic is now exposed to similar temptations; and it is because Professor Housman's *Prefaces* deal at some length and in plain English with the dangers of this situation that the judgment and experience they place at the disposal of the student of Shakespeare's text should not be neglected.

It has been possible to look at only a part of Professor Dover Wilson's work and from a particular angle. There can be no

question about the acceptance of the methods of approach he stands for ; they are, thanks in part to his labours, already accepted. He has, however, here and there still to subdue to the canons of criticism the new knowledge and methods of which these volumes are so valuable a record.

PETER ALEXANDER.

The life and death of Sir Thomas Moore, knight, sometimes Lord High Chancellor of England. Written by NICHOLAS HARPSFIELD. Now edited by E. V. HITCHCOCK, D.Lit., with an introduction on the continuity of English prose¹ from Alfred to More and his school, a life of Harpsfield, and historical notes by R. W. CHAMBERS, D.Lit., F.B.A., and with appendices. Early English Text Society. Vol. 186. London : Humphrey Milford. 1932. Pp. ccxxxi+400. 36s. net.

THE Committee of the Early English Text Society are to be warmly congratulated on this volume, for they have persuaded two first-rate scholars to collaborate in its production with the happiest results, and we may say at once that they have produced a classic example of how a text should be edited for the Society (cf. the present writer's remarks in *R.E.S.*, Vol. 5, p. 468). Indeed, it is difficult to know where to begin : their labours have given us an introduction of over two hundred pages packed with interest and information, while the text and commentaries run to another four hundred pages. Let us take the text first. For this Dr. Hitchcock is responsible, and she has made an exhaustive examination and collation of the eight known MSS., while it is indicative of her care to find that although nearly one-third of the Lambeth MS. had been copied, it was rejected once it became apparent that the Emmanuel MS. was, in general, superior. The Emmanuel MS., therefore, has become the basis for her text, but all important variations are given, and full textual notes discuss the variant readings.² A comparison of the printed text with the Emmanuel MS. gives the most satisfactory

¹ Published separately. London : H. Milford. Pp. 174. 6s. net.

² It may be worth while to put on record that the description of the Emmanuel MS., quoted on p. xiii from Dr. M. R. James' catalogue, is at fault in some particulars. More had no hand either in the "Speeches on the Act of Supremacy," which begin on f. 12, nor in the "Confession of Faith," which begins on f. 44. Indeed, the latter actually quotes from More's *English Works* of 1557!

results, and shows that we may rely on this text with every confidence.¹ Accompanying the text is a full and interesting account of the MSS., and an illuminating discussion of the principles underlying the problems of MS. descent. All inexperienced editors (and indeed many who have had untutored experience) will find it well worth their while to ponder the reflections of the editors in which they give us the results of their great experience in dealing with early texts. Besides this text and introduction, the *Life* is enriched by some seventy pages of historical notes by Dr. Chambers, full of digested learning about the historical events, and personages, and literature of More's time. (See, for examples, the discussion of the date of More's birth on pp. 299-304, or the question of his authorship of the *Life of King Richard the Third* on pp. 336-38.) As well as this, Dr. Chambers has cleared up many dark places in his Introduction to the *Life and Works of Nicholas Harpsfield*. He there deals with Harpsfield's birth and education, and for the first time makes clear the respective parts played by Nicholas and his brother John, which have hitherto been confused. Harpsfield's activities, his connection with Cardinal Pole, his growing difficulties and final imprisonment for more than twelve years in the Fleet Prison, his subsequent release and death, are all admirably elucidated for us. And rightly; for, as Dr. Chambers reminds us, Harpsfield's work is "the first serious attempt at a complete *Life* of More, with an account of his literary work. Roper's *Life*—perfect little gem as it is—is, in comparison, a mere sketch" (p. cciv). A few pages of the *Life* will convince any reader that there is much in Dr. Chambers' contention, and will arouse the question which Dr. Chambers turns triumphantly to answer: "How comes it that such prose as this could be written in the sixteenth century, and from whence does it derive?"

Important as is all the matter considered above, some readers may well consider it to be of limited interest to all but specialists; but when Dr. Chambers turns to consider the continuity of English prose he demands the attention of all interested in the development of our literature, and writes what I believe will come to be looked on as an epoch-making chapter in the history of English prose. He sails under no false colours; after a few pages the secret is out:

¹ On p. xiv, l. 11, instead of saying that the folios of the MS. after f. 28 are "only numbered here and there," it would be more accurate to note that only ff. 30 and 31 are numbered. Fol. 50 is numbered, but only in pencil: save for these three instances, all the other folios are unnumbered.

"To speak of More as 'the father of English prose' as was done in the early Nineteenth Century is wrong. *If English prose has any known father, that father is Ælfred Æthelwulfing*" (p. lvi).¹ We have only to remember the contrary doctrine that has been gaining ground during the past few decades to see what is here involved. That doctrine may be conveniently quoted in the confident assertion of Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch: "From Anglo-Saxon Prose, from Anglo-Saxon Poetry, our living Prose and Poetry have, save linguistically, no derivation."² *Voilà l'ennemi!* And, despite the fact that he never allows the button to come off his foil, Dr. Chambers gives a good many shrewd thrusts to Sir Arthur and other distinguished opponents before he has done with them.

Those who know Dr. Chambers' work will not be surprised at the thoroughness and complete mastery of his material with which he sets out to prove his thesis. He begins by an admirable survey of Pre-Conquest conditions, and extols the civilisation of Anglo-Saxon England just before the Conquest, by many references to its art, its architecture, and its literature, and this leads him to another of his unorthodox statements: "The history of England for the century before the Conquest, is not merely that of a wealthy and artistic people being plundered by a more noble, if less artistic, race. The essential thing is that the English civilise their conquerors" (p. lxxiii). All this part of his argument must be read and considered, especially by the professional historians, who are so wedded to the theory of the Norman superiority. Next, Dr. Chambers surveys the position of English prose under the Norman kings, and shows how English was banished from Court and driven far away, so that "in the century following the cessation of the Chronicle it appeared very possible that French and not English would be the language of England" (p. lxxxix). Up to this point Dr. Chambers has dealt with the growth and the suppression of our prose for official and historical use, and it might be argued that, despite a wealth of illustration and a decided bias in favour of Anglo-Saxon civilisation, there was little startling in all this. But when Dr. Chambers comes to consider that dark period between the mid-twelfth and the late fourteenth century he throws much light on dark places, and insists on an almost unknown chain of evidence: "the continuity of English prose is to be found in the sermon and

¹ *Italics mine.*

² *The Art of Writing* (1923), p. 163.

in every kind of devotional treatise."¹ This he supports by an examination of such well-known works as the *Ancren Riwle* and the writings by or ascribed to Rolle of Hampole, the works of Hilton, and others, and shows how much was available when Wiclif and his friends came to write their version of the scriptures. By the time we reach the end of his discussion of the position of prose at the end of the fourteenth century we are convinced that the tradition and practice of prose had never entirely died, but we see it "consecrated in a series of noble books, written for or by those who had withdrawn to cloister or hermitage in search of a peace they could not find in feudal England" (p. clxxiii).

Space fails to show how Dr. Chambers deals with the much-wronged fifteenth century, and how he finds the true line of descent, not through Pecock, Fortescue and Malory, but by the continuous influence of fourteenth-century devotional literature, and of how he deals with prose in the early sixteenth century and with More's contribution to its development. Even at the cost of omitting all this, and any critical examination of special points of Dr. Chambers' thesis, this detailed examination seemed worth while because it is so necessary to insist that here is a book which will make history, not by taking up some unorthodox opinion out of perversity, but because a lifetime of study and teaching have forced these conclusions on the author. And Dr. Chambers has put his case so persuasively, so temperately, and with such a wealth of illustration and comment, that it is difficult to see how it is to be challenged. One thing at least is certain: however the doctrine of the descent of English prose will be stated in the books of the next fifty years, account will have to be taken of this most learned and most persuasive of arguments.

H. S. BENNETT.

The Old English Alliterative Measure. By S. O. ANDREW.
Croydon: H. R. Grubb, Ltd. 1931. Pp. iv+82. 5s. net.

NEARLY half a century has passed since Eduard Sievers in Vol. 10 of *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache* gave his account

¹ I say "almost unknown" because readers of Dr. G. R. Owst's *Preaching in Medieval England*, and various scattered articles, will have noticed how he insists on the importance of the sermon in fields other than purely ecclesiastic. His forthcoming work, *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*, will show in great detail how much, not only our prose, but all our literature, owes to the mediæval sermons.

of the Old English Alliterative Measure, and that account has, with certain reservations, been accepted by scholars and, for good or for ill, the so-called *five types* have been inflicted upon successive generations of students. Now comes Mr. Andrew, to whom we are already deeply indebted for a skilful and lively modernized alliterative *Gawain*, and boldly challenges these hoary types. In a learned and well-developed thesis he indicates the lines along which a reconstructed metrical theory might be laid. "It may appear somewhat hardy," he admits in the *Preface*, "to challenge a classification so long and so generally accepted; but referring casually to Sievers's work a little while ago, I became aware that his scansion of many verses of *Beowulf* not only differed from my own, but also implied a stress, or more frequently a suppression of stress, which I found it very difficult to credit. . . . I was soon convinced that the text, if read with due regard to sense and speech-stress, points to a metrical classification in many ways quite different from that of Sievers, and that his scansions of over a thousand of the verses which he gives as examples of his various types involve false stressing." In this study Mr. Andrew confines himself mainly to *Beowulf*, though he makes it clear that he has examined in some detail the whole body of extant Old English poetry.

Sievers, he asserts, went too far in making natural speech-stress the mere servant of metrical necessity. Look at his D and E types! What Protean creatures they are! A close examination of these leaves one with the impression that nothing is impossible in Old English verse. But why not be honest and admit that these D and E types are figments? They are simply A and B types, respectively, with first feet "weighted." Numerous examples are adduced to show that Sievers, having formulated his system, forced every half-line into one or other of the prescribed patterns, committed the sin of violating natural word-stress and sentence-stress, and "made trouble for himself" again and again. A simpler and saner injunction should be followed. Be true to natural stress, in the faith that English speech-rhythm has changed little or not at all through the centuries, and you will then find that two, or at most three, types will suffice and that the natural rhythm of the ancient poetry will be restored.

All this is excellent in its way, but considerable difficulties remain. These the writer would remove by certain bold and breezy textual emendations which, we must confess, we find disconcerting. We

can seldom collate our texts since, with rare exceptions like the 128 lines of the *Address of the Soul to the Body* in both the Exeter and the Vercelli Books, Old English poems are extant in single MS. versions. Mr. Andrew therefore asks us to emend with courage, to change the word-order here and there, and to improve an imperfect rhythm by suppressing superfluous pronouns, adverbs and particles. There is, for example, "a traditional misquotation in the much-quoted refrain of *Deor*

þæs ofereode, þisses swá mæg

where 'swá' is a stress-word and 'mæg' (in that position) must also have stress. . . . The natural order is 'swá þisses mæg,' as in verses like 'swá Wedra helm.'" This is pure conjecture. Could we discover a true metrical theory for all Old English alliterative verse and be sure that the poets were all highly trained metrists after one and the same pattern, we might then use that theory "as a criterion both for the soundness of the text and for the right interpretation of it." Yet in spite of its amazing similarities in style and diction, the old poetry is too varied to admit of any such uniform treatment. And how can we ever hope to decide that expressions which seem awkward, or cacophonous, or illogical, or ambiguous to our modern ears, were such to the audiences of a thousand years ago?

This book is none the less an excellent piece of work, original, stimulating, and refreshing. Students of *Beowulf*, and of Old English poetry in general, should read it and weigh its arguments. We hope that the writer will find leisure to continue and extend such fruitful investigations.

SIMEON POTTER.

Doctrinal Terms in Ælfric's Homilies. By NELIUS O. HALVORSON, Ph.D. University of Iowa Studies, Vol. V, No. 1. Iowa City: University of Iowa. 1932. Pp. 98. \$.75

THIS study of the doctrinal terms used by Ælfric in his *Sermones Catholici* (the two series edited by Thorpe for the Ælfric Society in 1843-1846) is of more value to the lexicographer than to the student of doctrinal history. While the harvest of word-senses not already recorded by Bosworth and Toller is not large, it is of some use to have Ælfric's doctrinal vocabulary—the most difficult part of his

language—examined in more detail than the makers of dictionaries would presumably have time to do. In addition to supplementing their work, Dr. Halvorson's study is of value also as affording confirmation. If there had been a series of such studies of technical vocabulary in existence when the dictionaries were compiled, Old English lexicography would be on a much sounder basis than it actually is at the present time. While it is likely that not many recorded Old English words remain undiscovered, the analysis of senses and usages is still very incomplete and somewhat disorderly in the existing dictionaries. Such special studies as this on Ælfric's doctrinal terms supply a real need and are most welcome.

The material is arranged in a clear and concise form. The doctrinal terms are grouped around basic theological and doctrinal conceptions: for example, words describing the Trinity and relation of its persons form one sub-division; or, to mention one of the most important sections, the vocabulary of redemption, regeneration and grace are gathered into a chapter on Ælfric's teaching about salvation. The definiteness of the plan of the work has one disadvantage, however: there is a tendency to leave out material which does not fit into it. There is no explanation, for example, of *seo apostolic bletsung* (Thorpe, II, 268) "the apostolic blessing," which Bosworth and Toller also failed to record. The vocabulary of intercession is included only in relation to guardian angels; nothing is said of the mediation of the Virgin Mary or other saints, nor is there anything at all of any of the doctrines concerning the Virgin; angels and devils, however, receive comparatively full notices. There are even a few terms omitted which are related to included material, such as *tuwa acenned*, used of spiritual regeneration, and *upfærled* "ascension," a rare word which seems to be peculiar to Ælfric.

Incompleteness is inevitable also from the deliberately limited consideration of the doctrines which the terms were intended to explain. It is, of course, impossible to assign senses without making some assumption about the basic doctrine, and it must be said that Dr. Halvorson gives a number of brief explanations and indications of Ælfric's views. But it is when a decision is most needed, when he comes to controversial points which his work might help to decide, that he is most careful to declare such matters outside the scope of his work. Of Ælfric's "doctrine of the housel," for example, he says: "while the terms pertaining to the housel often reveal phases of its doctrine, an exhaustive treatment of Ælfric's doctrinal views on the

subject
treat
reveal
shoul
invol
A
as "
any c
gate
by et
in w
infor
"Eth
It is
pass
T
comp
and
inco
term
inde

Alli

Th
the
vers
that
of
Dr.
hav
sho
or t
a ta
we

subject is beyond the scope of this study." There is actually no treatment at all given to his doctrine of the housel, and no terms revealing aspects of his doctrine are quoted: the terms at least should have been within the scope of the study, but, because they involved a statement about the doctrine, they are omitted.

A number of etymologies of the more fundamental terms such as "sin," "hell," "God" are given, but there is nothing new in any of them. It is a pity that Dr. Halvorson did not rather investigate the history of some of the terms that have been less chewed upon by etymologists. He quotes, for example, the interesting passage in which the devil is compared to an immense *Silhearwa*; some information about this word, which does not seem to have meant "Ethiopian" originally, would have been a genuine contribution. It is not even certain that it meant specifically an Ethiopian in this passage: "blackamoor" would probably be a better rendering.

The chief defect of the work is, then, that the material is not complete: but the arrangement of what has been gathered is clear and the treatment competent. The material, moreover, is not as incomplete as the index would indicate: a considerable number of terms treated seem to have slipped through the meshes when the index was made.

E. V. GORDON.

Alliterative Poetry in Middle English: the Dialectal and Metrical Survey. By J. P. OAKDEN, M.A., Ph.D. Manchester University Press. 1930. Pp. xii+273. 12s. 6d. net.

THIS is a very ambitious work. Its title indicates that it covers the whole of the linguistic features of the output of alliterative verse in the Middle-English period. This is obviously a venture that would tax to the utmost the knowledge and powers of exposition of the most learned and most experienced of scholars. That Dr. Oakden has not reached the standard that such a scholar might have attained to is not surprising; the form and manner of his work show unmistakably that he has at present not the depth of learning or the mastery of clear exposition necessary for the performance of a task so immense and so exacting.

The author summarises his findings in a Conclusion. Here we have failed to discover any facts which had not already been

set forth—not, it is true, in one place, but at least in the various standard books that are in the hands of all students of the subject. It is good to find *On god ureisun of ure lefdi* put in its rightful place in the development of alliterative verse, but its importance had been adequately emphasised by Joseph Hall, who, moreover, made some excellent observations on the probable alterations of the text in the course of transmission, which Dr. Oakden might well have made his own. His correction of Hall's statement about the dialect might with advantage have been extended to include the characteristic rhyming of *ī* with *ē*, the "Saxon" (especially "East-Saxon") loss of *ȝ* before *n* (in *kwene/reine=rene*), and the rhyme *sumer/ȝeomer*, which is paralleled in *The Owl and the Nightingale*. Dr. Oakden appears to have got no further than his predecessors in determining "the intermediate stages of the process"—if such there were—which linked the earlier verse with the new growth—if it were new—of the fourteenth century. At this point we call attention to one of the inconsistencies of statement of which there are unfortunately many throughout the book. On p. 244 he says: "In the mid-fourteenth century a school of poets arose in the northern counties and Scotland which flourished for two centuries," while on the preceding page he states quite correctly, if rather jejune: "After 1400, however, several poems were written in Scotland." It is difficult to condone such carelessness.

The treatise begins with an Approach to Dialectal Questions. The relevance of much of this is not obvious; we think that it might at least have been advantageously abbreviated. It occupies one-sixth of the book, yet we find in it no treatment of one of the primary and basic texts for Middle-English dialectology, *Ancrene Wisse*, which one would have supposed to be indispensable for the author's study of the great mass of his material—the poems of the West Midlands. The number of the Dialectal Points of Middle English is here increased to forty-five, but we still miss the feature so characteristic of certain southerly dialects, the loss of final *n*, as in the strong past participles, and in such words as *seven* (*seue, seoue*), and the unvoicing of final consonants in general is not given its due importance. Vocabulary is entirely ignored. The Approach leads up to a dialectal map of England, in which lines are drawn to mark the limits of divergent developments of the same phoneme. Perhaps the most remarkable of these lines is that which concerns the representation of OE. *-ēag*, *-ēah* by ME. *-eȝ* (*-eiȝ*) or *-iȝ*. The

line tr
throug
bound
limits
directl
enclos
logists
-ēah is
Lea o
north
-iȝ reg
by a v
from
bids
"but,
above
we ha
be abl
by the
On p
indep
latter
the p
that t
not fo
had a
on pp
"It is
statist
being
remer
is fail
much
a vali
heavy
consi
he all
1 p
place-
in the
locally

line travels from the junction of Hampshire and Dorset northward through the middle of Wiltshire, skirts Gloucestershire, the western boundaries of Warwickshire and Staffordshire and the northern limits of Derby and Nottinghamshire, whence it passes almost directly southward through London to Beachy Head. The area enclosed by it is the area of *-iz*, according to the place-name dialectologists. Now, the most important place-name element containing *-ēah* is the word *lēah* "clearing"; and this is now represented by *Lea* or *Lee* in Worc., Leic., Derby, south-west Surrey, Staffs., north Warw., and Bucks., all within what we are assured is the *-iz* region. This is disturbing, but we suppose it will be explained by a very general supersession of the appropriate form by another from outside—truly a large assumption.¹ In any case Dr. Oakden bids us "accept the boundary from the place-name evidence," "but," he warns us, "it must be interpreted in accordance with the above statements" (*viz.* about the texts). What these amount to we have failed to discover, though some more patient reader may be able to unravel the tangled skein. Some light is thrown, however, by the author himself on the character of this place-name evidence. On p. 25 he writes: "Professor Wyld and Miss Serjeantson have independently collected the place-name material [*i.e.* for *eo*]. The latter concludes by saying that the rounded forms occur rarely in the place-names of Derby, Ches. [etc.]. . . . Professor Wyld says that the *u*-forms occur strangely enough in Lancs., but that he has not found any in Ches.; Miss Serjeantson, however, *has presumably had access to more forms.*" (The italics are ours.) Yet earlier, on pp. 8-9, Dr. Oakden shows a more critical attitude in saying, "It is for these reasons [*viz.* that overmuch reliance is placed on statistics of numbers] that we think place-name evidence is not being used with sufficient caution. . . . It is surely important to remember that county boundaries are not dialectal ones. . . . It is failure to observe these things that has led scholars to attach too much importance to place-name statistics." No doubt he has made a valiant attempt to act up to his convictions, but the odds were too heavy against him; for the textual conditions of the many documents considered by him have not yet been sufficiently explored, nor has he allowed himself the time or the space to do this for the purposes

¹ How deceptive the modern, not to speak of the Middle-English, spelling of place-names may be, even in so apparently simple a case as this of *lēah*, is illustrated in the pronunciation of *Ardingley* *ādiŋlai*, and of *North* and *South Leigh*, which are locally *nor lai* and *seu lai*.

of his book. And ultimately he is as much obsessed as any one by numbers and "border dialects."

The five chapters that follow are concerned with the history of the alliterative long line from the close of the Old English to the end of the Middle-English period, the addition of end-rhyme, and the development of rhymed alliterative stanzas. The sixth chapter deals with alliteration of stressed syllables in general, outside alliterative poetry proper. Here we will briefly remark that the highly significant poem *Somer Soneday* (recently re-edited by Carleton Brown), with its elaborate verse-form and its intricate stanza-linking, is not catalogued, and the characteristic alliterative combinations of the tail-rhyme romances are not referred to—there is just a bare mention of *The Erl of Tolous* and *Sir Percyvell* in the midst of a heterogeneous list on p. 236. On the other hand, a good deal is made of the *Satire on the Blacksmiths*, which is, after all, not much better than an alliterative freak, ingenious enough, though it breaks down sadly in its conclusion.

The second main section of the book is entitled "The Metrical Survey," of which perhaps the most valuable part should be the statistics concerning the occurrence of the many alliterative types used in the several poems (pp. 181 ff.), provided that one may rely absolutely upon their accuracy. Taking one of the shorter works, *Winner and Waster*, we note that it is stated that no example of the type ax/ax, etc., is found. We suggest that account might have been taken of Gollancz' convincing emendation of "Sendes bodworde" for "Send his erande" (l. 125), which gives us an example of ax/ax :

Sendes bodworde by me, als hym beste lyketh ;¹

and has not Dr. Oakden overlooked an instance of aa/xa in l. 356 ?

[Twelue] mese at a merke bytween twa men.

And in l. 78 an instance of aa/bb ?

Two with flowres of Fraunce before and behynde.

If we could suspect the author of this book of indulging in humour, he surely had his tongue in his cheek when he listed as an example of aa/xa the quotation from the Vulgate "Vanitas vanitatum et omnia vanitas" (l. 69) in *The Parlement of the Thre Ages*. It is given as the only instance of the type in that poem ! But this

¹ Or is this an instance of aa/ax ? Some of these analyses seem very insecure.

solemnity is explained when we discover that "ll. 642, 645 and 647 are written in Latin without alliteration." They are "Quia in inferno nulla est redemptio," "Ite ostendite vos sacerdotibus," and "Et ecce omnia munda sunt vobis" !

It is now necessary to justify by the citation of a few specimen examples the general accusation of carelessness and incoherence which was made at an earlier place in this review. On p. 12 the author of the *Ayenbite* is given as *Michael of Norgate*. We do not understand this new version of *dan Michel of Northgate*. Dan Michel himself distinguishes his name from that of the archangel *Michael*, which he writes a few lines below—a distinction which it is surely best for us to observe. Is *Norgate* merely a misprint? On p. 151 we have another novelty in *Hali Maidenhad*, for the usual *Meidenhad* (but better *Meiðhad*). On p. 12 again we read that *The Owl and the Nightingale* was "written in Dorset or Surrey about 1220." Whether the surviving versions or the original text be meant is not certain, nor is the situation cleared up by the succeeding statements (on pp. 14 and 15, respectively) to the effect that "this text was probably written in Dorset," and that its "exact place of composition is not known," but that it "may have been N. Wilts." On p. 23 it is said that "the word *gude*, O.E. *gōd*, often appears in a text which otherwise has only *ȝ*-forms . . . it is frequent in the Cotton MS. Nero A.X." This is untrue of this manuscript; Dr. Oakden must, we think, have confused his notes; what it does have is *goude*. On p. 24 Trevisa is included in a group of poetical texts which "all have *ē* in rhymes" ! On p. 27 we are told that "Chaucer has *eigh* and *eye*, with rare *ȝe*-forms, which occur even in rhymes." Why "even" in rhymes? Should not *ye*-forms have been used in rhymes? Or are not rhymes in Chaucer significant, while in other writers they "are the only secure test" (p. 24)? On p. 42 the First Worcester Fragment, which belongs to the twelfth century, is stated to be included in Carlton [*sic*] Brown's *Religious Lyrics of the 14th Century*, 1924, p. 237, which is manifestly incredible; and it is said to have the form *Canterburi*, whereas the reading of the text as given by Hall is *cantore'buri*. The *gawle* of *Pearl*, l. 461, is referred to an OE. *gāgl*, which we presume is intended for *gægl*; but this is an adjective, not a noun. As an example of quite unnecessary naïveté we quote: "Layamon's Brut. . . . This lengthy work is very important for our purpose. Unfortunately, it is very long." Dr. Oakden goes on to say that

he has examined only the 1885 lines of Hall's selections from the poem. Does he realise that the text of these selections is a regularised version with normalised spelling? If so, he gives us no indication.

It would be possible to multiply criticism of this and other kinds, but we prefer to conclude with a tribute to the enthusiasm and energy which must have gone to the making of this treatise, untidy and slapdash though it is. We would especially acknowledge the reference value of the catalogue of the numerous texts examined. We are prepared to believe that the author may be able to make a better job of the second volume which he promises, and which is to treat of the literary relationships of his poems; and here he may give us something new, since he seems to be on the track of an important piece of literary history in the investigation of the popular poetry of the earliest periods. But we would implore him not only to improve his scholarship but to school himself better in the art of expression, for which even hard-bitten philologists are known to have some regard.

C. T. ONIONS.

Merlin : A Middle English Metrical Version of a French Romance. By HERRY LOVELICH. Part III. Edited by ERNST A. KOCK. Early English Text Society. Original Series CLXXXV. London : Humphrey Milford. 1932 for 1930. Pp. iv+417-739. 25s. net.

WITH this volume Dr. Kock completes the publication of the text of Lovelich's *Merlin*, and for the first time the whole vast poem is accessible in print. The two earlier parts of the text appeared in the E.E.T.S. publications for 1904 and 1913; an introduction and notes will presumably be supplied by the editor in a fourth volume.

The section of the text now published contains Lovelich's poem from l. 15557 to the end of the manuscript and includes the first meeting of Merlin and Nimiane (Viviane of the French prose *Merlin*), the betrothal of Arthur and Gonnore, Arthur's fight with Rion, the meeting of Gawain and his brothers with Arthur and Arthur's knighting of them, and the expedition of Arthur, accompanied by Gawain and his men, to aid Ban of Banoik against his enemies. The manuscript ends while the account of the ensuing battle at

Trebes is still in progress. Up to this point Lovelich's poem has closely followed the same course as the French prose *Merlin*, but there is a good deal more of the prose which is left untold, probably because either Lovelich himself or the scribe tired of his work. Lovelich's hope that he may have some good wine

'My wyttes to scharpen & to redresse
'To maken an ende of this processe' (ll. 21587-8).

suggests that he had a suspicion that he was being tedious, and the modern reader will hardly regret that so uninspired a work should have been curtailed. It is, however, desirable from several points of view to have even the dulllest mediæval writings in an accessible form, and the laborious character of the poem should render students the more grateful to the editor who has so patiently worked to make it so.

Dr. Kock's textual methods in the present volume are, of course, those of the first two parts. He appears to favour a conservative treatment of the manuscript and only alters its readings where a word is obviously omitted or mis-spelt and occasionally where a form is ungrammatical. He has not made alterations for metrical reasons though some lines seem to leap to the eye as corrupt in this respect; a few examples chosen at random are l. 19420 (which could be made to read smoothly by omitting *that pere*), l. 22305 (probably *velenye* should be omitted), l. 22310 (omit *neþer*), l. 25680 (omit *kyng loth*). Probably Dr. Kock proposes to deal with such lines in his introduction or notes.

DOROTHY EVERETT.

A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue. Edited by Sir WILLIAM A. CRAIGIE. Part II, *Assembling-Berising*. University of Chicago Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1932. Pp. 121-240. 21s. net.

WITH part two of the new Scottish dictionary we pass away from the *a*-words, which are as a rule comparatively uninteresting, to the *b*-words, which, perhaps by reason of their sharply marked initial consonant, tend to be more expressive. In part I we had occasion to notice the very large number of words of Latin origin which were to be found in Scottish speech. In proportion, these are not nearly so numerous in part II. Here, perhaps for the first time, we begin to see to something like its full extent the influence of France on the Scottish language, whether through the University

or through military service or through general cultural relations. The French *béjaune*, "yellow beak," the nickname for a freshman at the Sorbonne, has given rise to the common *bajan* for a first-year student. From soldiering in France comes *battard* (Fr. *bâtard*), for a small cannon. OFr. *bahu(d)*, *bahut*, "chest, coffer," is common in the form *bahuif* and a number of variants such as *balhoy*, while a common word for "whalebone" is *ballen*, *balane*, from OFr. *baleine*. The borrowing is not confined to terms of a specialised or technical application; we may note such an adjective as *bastant*, "sufficient," or verbs such as *begary* (Fr. *bigarrer*), "to decorate with stripes," *barbulye*, "to besmear, confuse, etc."

As was to be expected, there is a goodly sprinkling of words of Scandinavian origin. Some of these are from the Orkneys or Shetlands, and hardly belong to the Scottish language proper, e.g. *ayrskift*, "division of property," from ON. *arfskift*, or the Orkney dialectal *beare*, "wave," from ON. *bara*, "wave, billow," but others are more widely distributed, e.g. *belly-flaucht*, "with the skin pulled off over the head," corresponding to modern Icel. *belg-fláttur*, or *bensell*, "bending, tension, excitement," from ON. *benzl*, "bent state of a bow."

The contributions from Gaelic are but few. Celtic heathenism has given us *beltane*, while Celtic Christianity has given us *bauchill*, "episcopal staff," from Gaelic *bachall*. The greeting *bannachadee* from the Gaelic *beannachadh Dé*, "the blessing of God," found in the *Buke of the Howlat*, can hardly be reckoned as naturalised, but the case is different with *benok*, "a species of skin or hide," apparently a diminutive of Gaelic *bian*, "skin, hide."

Characteristic Scotticisms are *bangster*, "violent person, bully," with the derivative *bangstrie* to describe his behaviour, *bawsy* used apparently in the sense "large and clumsy" by Henryson and Dunbar, but of unknown origin, and *baudrons*, again of obscure origin, a common nickname for a cat. The common word *bard* has a distinctive shade of meaning in Scotland which is of historical interest. In England, where the *bard* was sufficiently remote, whether he was in Scotland or Ireland, for close contact with him to be impossible, he was "the poet," and soon became a romantic figure. In Scotland this Gaelic term for the minstrel was almost always used as a term of reproach or contempt, of a vagabond minstrel, a buffoon, a scurrilous person, even of a woman of evil life, and *bardrie* denoted "scurrilous language."

There is not much that is new of purely etymological interest, but we may note that for the first time the history of the word *assith*, "satisfaction, especially for wrong or injury," is satisfactorily explained as going back to OFr. *asset*, a variant of the common *assez*, while the derivation of *bawbee* from the territorial designation of one Alexander Orrok of *Sillebawbe*, made Master of the Mint in 1538, is finally settled.

ALLEN MAWER.

Thomas Lodge : The History of an Elizabethan. By N. BURTON PARADISE. New Haven : Yale University Press : London : Humphrey Milford. 1931. Pp. ix+254. 16s.

THE chief interest of this study of Lodge is biographical. Here, for the first time for many years, new facts concerning Lodge's life are brought to light to supplement the somewhat scanty data collected by his nineteenth-century biographers. The new facts for the most part shed light on the financial difficulties of Lodge's early life. Mr. Paradise shows that already as a minor Lodge laid up trouble for himself by borrowing, "at divers and several times," "divers sums of money," and the consequent lawsuits to which he had recourse to free himself from the demands made upon him shed light not only on Lodge's own difficulties but also on the unscrupulous and cynical manner in which the unbusinesslike habits of the young Elizabethan were exploited by the usurer. Mr. Paradise's researches make it clear that at times Lodge was financially in very low water. In 1593-4 he was involved in a lawsuit with his elder brother William, who, he alleged, as an executor under the will of Lady Lodge, had failed to pay certain legacies which were due to him. Thomas made a technical mistake in taking the matter to the Star Chamber and was fined for his error; twelve months later, however, when sued by William for the fine, he was described as "wholly decayd" and excused payment on the grounds of his extreme poverty.

As a result of Mr. Paradise's researches the fact emerges that there were several Thomas Lodges, in or near London, contemporaneous with Thomas Lodge the writer. One of these at least, a Thomas Lodge of the parish of St. Sepulchre, seems to have been connected with the family of the writer since he and his wife and child are mentioned in the will of Lady Laxton. Mr. Paradise

proves beyond a doubt that it was this Thomas Lodge of St. Sepulchre's who made the will of 1583 which has till now been accepted as an early will of the writer's.

All who are interested in the life and writings of Lodge have reason to be grateful to Mr. Paradise for the new facts which he has brought to light, but at the same time some of his material, especially that concerning the Lodge family, is inadequate and untrustworthy. In some cases Mr. Paradise's conclusions are based on what is obviously insufficient and inconclusive evidence. There is, for example, no proof that the William Lodge of the parish of St. James, Clerkenwell, who died in 1625, was the elder brother of the writer. Many gaps in information and some misrepresentations could have been avoided by reference to such obvious sources of information as county histories and parish registers. Sir Thomas Lodge, for example, is described as "of ancient Shropshire stock," but the pedigree Mr. Paradise quotes (from MS. Harleian 1982) says explicitly that he was descended in the male line from the Littletons "of ffranckleyn in com: Worster," *i.e.* from the family of the well-known judge and legal writer of Frankley in Worcestershire. Again, since Sarah Lodge, who is described in this same pedigree as the daughter of Sir Thomas Lodge by a second marriage (after the death of Lady Lodge in 1579), married Edward White the publisher in 1576, Mr. Paradise concludes that she must have been a niece or cousin of Sir Thomas. The Lodge pedigree in the 1623 *Visitation of Shropshire* agrees with that of Harleian MS. 1982 in describing Sarah as Sir Thomas' daughter by a second marriage. Clearly something is wrong in these two pedigrees. An examination of the parish register of St. Michael, Cornhill, however, at once makes it clear that Margaret Parker, the mother of Sarah Lodge, was the first wife and not the second (as has been generally accepted) of Sir Thomas. Her two daughters, Sarah and Susan, were christened on December 20, 1549, and October 11, 1551. The former married Edward White, the latter Thomas Leycester of Worleston (Ormerod, *History of Cheshire*, vol. iii, p. 358), and her son Richard Leycester was the "Richarde Lesetter" to whom Lady Lodge left a small legacy in her will. Mrs. Margaret Lodge was buried April 26, 1552, and later the same year Sir Thomas Lodge must have married Anne Luddington. Their eldest son, William, was christened September 29, 1553.

At times Mr. Paradise seems to abandon the search for new

facts too readily. More concerning William, Nicholas and Henry Lodge could have been found in the parish register of Rolleston and the will of Nicholas, while the date of Thomas Lodge's graduation at Avignon (January 12/13, 1598), for which Mr. Paradise denies all record, could have been ascertained from the one place where documentary evidence could reasonably be expected to exist—the Archives of Avignon. On one occasion at least Mr. Paradise fails to make full use of his own discoveries. He concludes that "it is impossible to say" in which of the ships that accompanied Cavendish on his ill-starred voyage to South America Lodge returned home, but if in February 1593 Lodge visited Rolleston to demand his legacy from William he could not have been in the *Desire*, which did not reach Ireland until June 1593. The fact is interesting since the *Desire* is the only ship of Cavendish's unfortunate expedition the date of whose safe return is recorded. Altogether the first three chapters of Mr. Paradise's book present about half a dozen new facts concerning Lodge's life embedded in a great deal of material which called for a much more careful, critical and judicious examination than it has received.

The account of Lodge's writings—to which the three following chapters of this study are devoted—add little to our knowledge of Lodge's literary work and do not even represent the sum of existing knowledge concerning his writings. An examination of the late Dr. Breul's book on *Sir Gowther* (to which Mr. Paradise refers in a footnote) would have eliminated at least three errors in his account of *The Life of Robert second Duke of Normandy*. Lodge's dramatic writings are dealt with in some detail and Mr. Paradise notes the hitherto unrecorded fact that Appian and not Plutarch furnished the raw material for *The Wounds of Civill War*, but the chapter on The Man of Letters gives nothing more than a superficial survey of Lodge's writings in chronological order marred by disproportionately lengthy quotations and some careless errors, such as the inclusion of Josephus in a list of fourteenth to sixteenth century writers.

The work concludes with three appendices. The first contains abstracts of the wills of Sir William and Lady Laxton, Sir Thomas and Lady Lodge and Thomas Lodge of St. Sepulchre's; the second, a list of Lodge's borrowings noted by earlier writers; and the third, a Chronological List of Lodge's writings which includes descriptions of the title pages of the first editions of Lodge's works.

The last is bibliographically useless since it contains no statement of the copies from which the descriptions were made and at least a dozen errors, some of which are a legacy from the Hunterian Club edition of Lodge's works from which some of these descriptions were apparently made. The *Paradoxes against common Opinion* here attributed to Lodge was, as was pointed out in the *T.L.S.*, August 30, 1931, not the work of Lodge but a re-issue of the 1593 edition of Anthony Munday's *Paradoxes* translated from Charles Estienne.

Altogether what is new in this book might much more profitably and more wisely have been included in a short article embodying the new facts Mr. Paradise has discovered concerning Lodge's life. As an attempt "to present him in the position which he must have occupied in his own world and to estimate his contribution to our literary history," the work is inadequate and contributes little that is new and much that is inaccurate and misleading to our knowledge of Lodge's work as a writer.

ALICE WALKER.

Shakespeare's Iterative Imagery. By CAROLINE F.E. SPURGEON.
Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy 1931.
London: Humphrey Milford. Pp. 34. 1s. 6d. net.

It is difficult to be moderate in praise of Professor Spurgeon's British Academy Shakespeare Lecture. Only the feeling that something must be kept in reserve for the book or books to which this is the brief preamble restrains one from piling up the superlatives. Its distinction of style and matter as a lecture compels admiration, and it indicates the general scope and method of her work as a whole in such a way as to rouse expectancy to the highest pitch. What matters most, however, is the fact that from this lecture, and her previous one delivered to the Shakespeare Association, it becomes evident that Professor Spurgeon's work on Shakespeare's imagery is going to prove a landmark in the history of Shakespearian studies. It constitutes the most definite contribution that has been made since the bibliographical work of Professor A. W. Pollard and Dr. W. W. Greg. As surely as theirs, or Coleridge's, or Bradley's, her work marks an epoch.

For over six years Professor Spurgeon has been assembling, sorting and examining Shakespeare's imagery on a systematic basis. She is studying his images not to "point or illustrate any

preconceived idea or thesis, but . . . either as a whole, or in groups, with a perfectly open mind, to see what information they yield." She gathers much by the way, but her ultimate quarry is no less than Shakespeare himself. She believes that "a poet, and more especially a dramatic poet, to some extent unconsciously 'gives himself away' in his images." Hence her method of approach "not only throws light from a fresh angle . . . upon Shakespeare's imaginative and pictorial vision, upon his own ideas about his own plays and the characters in them, but . . . also enables us to get nearer to Shakespeare himself, to his mind, his tastes, his experiences, and his deeper thought." It will serve finally, she believes, as a touchstone of authorship.

In an hour's lecture to illustrate not only her method but also to give examples of all these exciting kinds of results might well tax the ingenuity of the most expert; but in print as well as in person Professor Spurgeon's enthusiasm carries her and us through an amazing amount. It is, perhaps, unfair to single out any one item for especial praise, but it is probable that both here and in her completed work one of the sections which will attract most interest is that in which she deals with the repetitive imagery running throughout Shakespeare's work as a whole. The example given is a simple one, but none the less significant. "It is quite certain that one of the things which rouse Shakespeare's bitterest and deepest indignation is feigned love and affection assumed for a selfish end. . . . Whenever the idea of false friends or flatterers occurs we find a rather curious set of images which play round it. These are, a dog or spaniel, fawning and licking, candy, sugar or sweets, thawing or melting. So strong is the association of these ideas in Shakespeare's mind, that it does not matter which of these items he starts with . . . it almost invariably, when used in this particular application, gives rise to the whole series." The illustrations then quoted are of extraordinary interest, and though not used in that connection in the lecture are in themselves an instructive object-lesson to the parallel-hunter as to what sort of parallels may reasonably be considered as a clue to authorship. These dominant images and individual associations bring at last something real into the nightmare world where "stylistic" evidence flourishes. And here at last we feel, in conclusion, is the scholar capable of leading us along an Elizabethan "road to Xanadu" even without the aid of the poet's note-book.

M. ST. CLARE BYRNE.

Ben Jonson. Edited by C. H. HERFORD and PERCY SIMPSON.
Volume IV. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1932. Pp.
xvi+620. 21s. net.

EVERY one interested either in Elizabethan literature or in English scholarship will welcome the new volume of the Oxford Jonson and applaud the indefatigable labour which Mr. Simpson has devoted to the exact determination of the text. It would seem that either the textual problems become more complicated as we advance through the canon, or the editor finds it necessary to delve ever deeper into their mysteries, for whereas the introductions to the four plays in the previous volume (*The Tale of a Tub*, *The Case is Altered*, and the two *Every Man's*) ran to thirty pages, no less than sixty-five are here devoted to the introductions to *Cynthia's Revels*, *Poetaster*, *Sejanus*, and *Eastward Ho*. And this is over and above the lavish bibliographical information given in the form of reproductions, either photographic or in type-facsimile, of different or variant titles and other significant pages from the quartos and folios, which reach an aggregate of twenty-eight. Of these no less than fifteen belong to *Eastward Ho*, the peculiarities of which are thus for the first time fully illustrated, and they include, of course, the original and altered forms of the pages E3^v and E4. My only complaint is that these variant settings have been printed back to back, instead of facing each other for convenience of comparison, as might quite easily have been done. Particular interest attaches to the reproduction of a unique additional leaf found in the Huntington copy of *Cynthia's Revels*, which bears on the recto a printed (and very badly printed) dedication to Camden. In this Jonson hails his old schoolmaster as "Britanniae Phoebus, Musarumque suarum parens optimus." Unfortunately Mr. Simpson was not aware of another special dedication existing in the former Britwell copy (sale of 14 March, 1923, lot 384), of which Mr. F. S. Ferguson has kindly supplied me with the following transcript :

AVTHOR
ad Librum.

GOe little Booke, GOe little Fable
unto the bright, and amiable
LVCY of BEDFORD ; she, that Bounty
appropriates still unto that County :
Tell her, his Muse that did inuent thee
to CYNTHIAS fayrest Nymph hath sent thee,
And sworne, that he will quite discard thee
if any way she do reward thee
But with a Kisse, (if thou canst dare it)
of her white Hand ; if she can spare it.

The meticulous care that was taken over the printing of the quarto in 1601 is shown by the fact that cancel slips bearing the words "CYNTHIAS Reuells" were pasted on to certain pages on which the running title had been given as "The Fountaine of Selfe-loue". It also appears in the minute correction to which at least some portions of the text were subjected, presumably by Jonson himself, while the sheets were passing through the press. This practice of correction is mainly responsible for swelling the introductions, for those to *Cynthia's Revels* and *Eastward Ho* are largely occupied with lists of variants between different copies of the respective first quartos. These lists afford, of course, evidence of the most valuable nature for the determination of the text, besides being a very interesting study in themselves. But such evidence is always liable to raise difficult questions, and it seems to be unusually puzzling in the present case. I accept without question Mr. Simpson's presentation of the textual facts, but I confess that I am unable to make sense of them. In *Eastward Ho* the variants appear to be tolerably rational: one is sometimes forced to assume three states of the sheets (cf. III, ii, 189, 262; IV, i, 163-64, ii, 260-61), but that is not unusual; also the record appears in some cases incomplete (II, ii, 78; IV, ii, 260-61) which is probably accidental. But in *Cynthia's Revels* the facts as presented are not, so far as I can see, bibliographically reasonable. It will suffice if we examine a portion of the evidence. On p. 6 Mr. Simpson has a heading: "Corrections in the outer forme of C", which he duly follows up with lists for C₁, C₂^v, and C₃. But before passing on to C₄^v he interposes C₃^v, which, of course, belongs to the inner forme. This must be a slip, and we may neglect it in considering the problem. Now of the five copies collated it appears that, in the outer forme of C, copies B and D generally show uncorrected readings, where A, C, and E generally show corrected ones. But there are certain instances (i) of reversal (B, D corrected, A, C, E uncorrected), and (ii) of different distribution (e.g. B uncorrected, A, C, D, E corrected). I will transcribe the record for the page C₁ together with Mr. Simpson's comment, and add in brackets the anomalous variants from later pages:

Sig. C 1. iii.	25	garbe, B	garbe; A, C, D, E
	27	illiterate, B	illiterate; A, C, D, E
	31	Trauaile: B, D	Trauaile; A, C, E
		gesture, B, D	gesture; A, C, E
	38	resi- ded, and A, C, E	resided, and B, D

This page was twice corrected : once to make the semicolons uniform, as they are in the Folio ; and, secondly, to adjust the original spacing of the Quarto in lines 37-9 . . .

[Sig. C2 ^r 1. iv. 69	and <i>A, C, E</i>	& <i>B, D</i>
73	<i>Asot, A, C, E</i>	<i>Asot. B, D</i>
74	<i>i'l'e A, C, E</i>	<i>i'l'e B, D</i>
Sig. C3 120	humour <i>A, C</i>	humor <i>B, D, E]</i>

Now from the comment two points emerge. One is that Mr. Simpson is not merely thinking of the distinction between a correct and an incorrect reading, but that he assumes the former to be a correction of the latter, not the latter to be a perversion of the former. The other is that he appears to believe that a double correction will account for a *reversal* of the usual order, whereas all it can really do is to affect the *distribution*. I quite agree that the type has been more than once corrected. Indeed, since the forme is the unit, there appear to be no less than four states traceable. Copy *B* shows the most incorrect state as in 1, iii, 25, 27 : *D* was the next to be printed, and after this comes the main revision, as shown by the agreement of *B* and *D* in errors *passim* : then *E* was printed, before the introduction of a final alteration in 1, iv, 120 : and lastly *A* and *C* after this alteration had been made. This is a remarkable result, but it follows of necessity if the evidence is correct, and there is nothing impossible or contradictory in it. But no multiplication of states will account for a reversal such as that in 1, iii, 38 or 1, iv, 73. Any given pull from a particular forme must necessarily be either wholly earlier or wholly later than any other given pull : it cannot possibly preserve the impress of the type in an earlier state at one point and a later state at another point ! If, therefore, it be granted that the corrections in general prove that, as regards the outer forme of sheet C, copy *B* was pulled earlier than copy *A*, it is physically impossible that in 1, iii, 38, for example, the reading of *B, D* should be a *correction* of the reading of *A, C, E* ; the alteration (whether correction or corruption) must have been in the opposite direction. This is what I mean when I say that the tables as printed make bibliographical nonsense. I can only suppose that I have somehow failed to grasp Mr. Simpson's intention, and I will therefore refrain from inquiring further into the significance of the variants and their application to the determination of the text. But I hope that Mr. Simpson will tell us without delay exactly what he does mean and what interpretation he puts upon these facts.

W. W. GREG.

A Bibliography of Dr. John Donne. By GEOFFREY KEYNES.
Second Edition. Cambridge University Press. 1932. Pp.
xvi+195. £2 12s. 6d.

DR. KEYNES' *Bibliography* has been indispensable to all serious students of Donne ever since its first appearance in 1914. This second edition, magnificently produced by the Cambridge University Press, contains much new material, and takes account of recent advances in our knowledge of Donne's life and work. In Dr. Keynes' hands bibliography is an art as well as a science. He has all the bibliographer's zest for recording collations, cancels, variant issues, and the like, but the introductions which he prefixes to each section of the book give the work a pleasantly literary flavour, and in the appendices dealing with portraits of Donne, books in Donne's library, and books by Donne's son, he has collected a vast amount of interesting material of a kind not strictly bibliographical, but valuable to all who care for Donne as a man and not merely as a museum exhibit. Twelve new illustrations have been added, and of these the most attractive is the reproduction on the title-page of the beautiful miniature of Donne by Isaac Oliver. The original is in the royal collection at Windsor Castle.

Since the war Donne has gained fresh importance as a living force in English literature, and a band of scholars in England and America have thrown new light on the details of his career, and have produced editions of many of his works. All this material has been faithfully recorded by Dr. Keynes, and his section on "Biography and Criticism" now contains 151 items as compared with 40 in the first edition. This list, however, has one fault in arrangement. Reviews should not have been numbered as separate items, but should have been grouped under the book reviewed. It is disconcerting to find, in a list intended to be in chronological order, that in one case a review precedes by several numbers the book with which it is supposed to deal.

Since the appearance of the first edition some bibliographical problems have been settled, but others still await solution. The mystery of the cancel in the introductory leaves of the first issue of *Essays in Divinity* was solved by the discovery of one perfect and several imperfect copies containing the whole or part of a cancelled preface to Sir Harry Vane. But the *XXVI Sermons* of 1660 still bristles with difficulties. I am able to supplement

Dr. Keynes' description by some additional bibliographical details. He calls attention to the very irregular collation and pagination, and to the fact that signatures R and Eee are omitted altogether. He omits, however, a number of minor irregularities in the Pp-Tt sheets. Qq1 and 2 are marked as Qqq and Qqq2 respectively. The Rr sheet begins correctly with Rr, followed, however, by Rrr2. Ss and Ss2 are marked as Sss and Sss2, and Tt2 appears as Ttt2.

There are also marked differences in typography. Sermons 1-12 (B-Aa⁴) are printed throughout in a fairly thick type. Sermon 12 finishes on Aa⁴, the last few lines being printed in a very small italic type, not used elsewhere in these pages. Aa⁴ verso is blank, and has no pagination, as Dr. Keynes records. Also, whereas Aa⁴ is correctly paged as 183, the pagination of Bb returns to 177 (already used for Aa1), repeats 177 for Bb1^v, and then continues with 179-183 for Bb2-4. Also the type used on Bb1 and throughout the following sheets up to Ll4 is a thinner type than that employed in sheets B-Aa⁴. Clearly there was some dislocation between Aa⁴ and Bb, and the most likely explanation is that while Sermons 1 to 12 were being printed on sheets B-Aa by one printing press, Sermons 13-18 were simultaneously being printed on sheets Bb-Ll by another. Sermon 12 finished on Aa⁴, and Aa⁴^v was left blank, because Sermon 13, which was to follow it, had already been printed on Bb. But there was some miscalculation over the pagination, so that Nos. 177-183, which had already been used for Sermon 12, were repeated in Sermon 13.¹

The division of the printing between thick and thin types, which we may for the moment call Type 1 (thick) and Type 2 (thin) continues throughout the latter part of the volume. It is significant that the omission of sheet Eee and of nos. 393-396 in the pagination between Sermons 25 and 26 corresponds with a change from Type 1 to Type 2. Here again there was some lack of co-ordination in the printing.

Mr. Sparrow has suggested to me that possibly the repetition of Sermons 3 and 5 as Sermons 17 and 16 respectively may be due to the younger Donne's possession of two manuscript volumes of his father's work. The contents of the *LXXX* and *Fifty Sermons* had evidently been prepared and arranged by Donne himself. But the arrangement of *XXVI Sermons* is so chaotic that it seems

¹ The repetition of 177 on Bb1^v between 177 and 179 is a mere misprint for 178.

likely that the younger Donne was tempted by the Restoration in 1660 to make a hasty bid for preferment by issuing another volume of his father's sermons. The Lothian and Dowden MSS. are examples of manuscript volumes into which a number of Donne's sermons have been transcribed, not by his own hand. The younger Donne was the most careless of editors, and if he came into possession of two volumes of miscellaneous sermons by his father, he may have failed to notice that two of the sermons appeared in both collections. Differences of transcription would account for the slight variations of text between the two versions of Sermons 3 and 5, and the confusion would be increased by the fact that Sermon 5 is described in the heading as "Preached to the King at *White-hall*, February 12, 1629," whereas in its second appearance as Sermon 16, the heading gives the date as "*February 22, 1629.*" If the printing was carried on by two different presses, the repetition would not be discovered till the various sections of the work were brought together.

In the hope that in the course of time Dr. Keynes will give us a third edition, I offer a few suggestions and corrections.

The list of copies in Oxford College libraries is curiously incomplete, comparing unfavourably with the completeness of the Harvard College Library entries. Dr. Keynes omits the libraries of Balliol, Brasenose, Jesus, Queen's and Magdalen Colleges altogether from his index. Yet Balliol has copies of the 1633 *Poems*, *LXXX Sermons*, *Biathanatos* (1648 and 1700 editions), *Letters* (1654), and an imperfect copy of the original issue of *Essayes in Divinity* (1651) with some leaves of the cancelled dedication. Brasenose has *Pseudo-Martyr*, *Poems* (1633), *Six Sermons* (1634), *Biathanatos* (1648), and the *LXXX* and *Fifty Sermons*. Magdalen Library has *Pseudo-Martyr*, *Encænica*, *Devotions* (1624, first edition), *Deaths Duell* (1632), *Biathanatos* (1648), and the *LXXX* and *Fifty Sermons*. The Magdalen copy of the first edition of the *Devotions* is particularly interesting. Like Dr. Keynes, I have not found any copy in which C 2 is not a cancel, but this volume has traces of the original sheet. A stub of the original C 2 verso has been pasted on the side of C 3 (page 29). The fragmentary words on the stub show that the endings of the first nine lines were identical with those in the cancel. Lines 10 and 11 are illegible, but lines 12-14 end in the stub "D," "sp," "p []," compared with "he," "which," "not," in the cancel. Thus it is probable that the re-setting began at l. 11 with "hee that hath no more" and continued as far as "that earth,

which hee is" (l. 15). In the last two lines on the page, ending "much" and "if" and in the catchword "all," the original and the cancel agree again.

Jesus College has the undated first issue of *Biathanatos*, the 1634 edition of *Ignatius his Conclaue, Poems* (1654), *Letters* (1654), and the *LXXX Sermons*. It has also a copy of the Tobie Matthew collection of *Letters* (1660), edited by the younger Donne, of which Dr. Keynes records no Oxford copy.

Queen's College also is rich in early editions of Donne. It has the *Poems* of 1633, and 1654 (two copies), *Pseudo-Martyr, Juvenilia* (1633, second edition), *Paradoxes, Problemes* (1652) bound up with *Essayes in Divinity* (defective), *Encenia* (defective), and *LXXX Sermons*.

Dr. Keynes mentions a number of copies of Donne's works in Christ Church Library, but his list omits some of the rarest items—for example, the copy of the first issue of the sermon preached at St. Paul's Cross on September 15, 1622. Dr. Keynes records only two copies of this issue, one in the British Museum and one in his own possession. Christ Church also has copies of the *Sermon to the Virginian Company* (1622), and the *Sermon to the King at Whitehall* (1626), no Oxford copies of which are recorded by Dr. Keynes, apart from the bound-up volume of *Fiue Sermons* in Merton Library, in which these sermons are included.

Dr. Keynes records for the first time a variant issue of the second edition (1633) of *Deaths Duell*. The only copy known is in Dr. Keynes' own library. From the description here given of it, it would seem to be an earlier issue, and not, as Dr. Keynes suggests, a later one. If the address *To the Reader* "contains several errors," that would furnish a reason for re-setting the sheet, whereas, according to Dr. Keynes' hypothesis, that the new issue was the later one, "it is not obvious why the alteration should have been made," to quote his own words.

A few misprints and trifling errors should be corrected. On page 82, line 3, read "1633" for "1663," and "pp. 118-122" for "pp. 108-111." On the same page, line 9, read "p. 125" for "p. 114." In the list of illustrations, the portrait of Donne prefixed to the *Letters* of 1651 is described as "John Donne, æt. 59," while on page 82 it appears as "a bust of Donne at the age of 40." On page 103 Dr. Keynes says that he has been unable to find a copy of William Corkine's *Second Booke of Ayres* (1612). There is, however, one in the British Museum.

Dr. Keynes omits the name of the original publisher of *Biathanatos*. The title-page of the first issue has "London, Printed by John Dawson," without publisher or date. But the Stationers' Register shows that the publisher was Henry Seyle or Seale, who had published Donne's *Juvenilia* in 1633. For September 25, 1646, we find an entry "Master War. Seale. Entred for his copie under the hands of Master Rushworth and Master Whitaker warden a tract called, *Biathanatos a declaracon of that paradox or thesis that selfe homicide is not*, etc. . . . vjd." Seale was a Warden of the Stationers' Company for the year 1646-47. In 1648 the sheets of *Biathanatos* were re-issued with a new title-page bearing the words "London, Printed for Humphrey Moseley, and are to be sold at his shop at the Princes Armes in St. Pauls Churchyard. 1648." An entry in the Stationers' Register shows that Seale's rights in the book were transferred to Moseley on June 13, 1649.

Again, "M.P." the printer of *Wisdom crying out to Sinners* (1639) has not been identified by Dr. Keynes. McKerrow's *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers* shows that Marmaduke Parsons was the printer of most of the works bearing the initials M.P. between 1625 and 1639, and if the initials here are genuine, there is no other known printer of the time whom they will fit.

The index is the least satisfactory feature of the book. It is so incomplete as to be seriously misleading. I was surprised to find in it only one mention of the Stationers' Register, but study of the book itself showed that the Register is mentioned on at least eight different pages. The index mentions only one Donne manuscript at Trinity College, Cambridge, but there is a second, containing the only known manuscript version of the *Catalogus Librorum*, and on p. 137 Dr. Keynes shows that he was aware of my discovery of this volume. Similarly the entries relating to Izaak Walton, Sir Henry Wotton, and Mr. John Hayward—to take a few names at random—are all incomplete.

These, however, are but minor blemishes in a book for which all lovers of Donne will be grateful.

The chapters on the *Poems*, the *Letters*, and the *Sermons* are particularly rich in new material. There is a valuable list of manuscripts of the poems, and a fine collotype reproduction of a page of *The Extasie* from the Leconfield MS. The chapter on the *Sermons* gives us four additional facsimiles of title-pages, describes a variant issue of *Deaths Duell*, and supplies a list of extant manu-

scripts of the sermons. The chapter on the *Letters* records fully the new material which has recently come to light, and gives numerous corrections in the ascriptions of letters found in the 1651 and Tobie Matthew collections. Appendix I, dealing with the works of John Donne the younger, has been much enlarged, and Appendix V, "Iconography," describes one oil painting and two miniatures in addition to the portraits previously mentioned.

One of the most delightful features of the book is Appendix III, giving a list of books from Donne's library. In the first edition this appendix contained the names of only fourteen books, nearly all of them dull controversial tracts. In the new edition we have no less than sixty-one titles, and although the majority are theological or legal works, required by Donne for such a book as *Pseudo-Martyr*, there are others which have a bearing on his poetry. Mr. John Sparrow, who discovered a number of these volumes with Donne's signature and motto, has given us a full account of one of them in an article in the *London Mercury* for December 1931. From it we learn that Donne was familiar with certain little-known poems of late Latin literature, that he marked and annotated them, and that they may have had an influence on his poems. We knew already that Donne, unlike most Englishmen of his time, was familiar with Dante, but it is interesting to find that he possessed a copy of Dante's *Convivio*. He also owned a copy of the *Chirurgia Magna* of Paracelsus, whose enigmatic figure appears in *Ignatius his Conclau*.

The motto inscribed by Donne in his books, *Per Rachel ho servito e non per Lia*, has puzzled commentators. Dr. Keynes records that it is a quotation from Petrarch (*Canz.* xix, st. 7, l. 1), and that it paraphrases a sentence in Genesis xxix. 25. He is, however, still mystified by Donne's choice, and remarks, "Why Donne should have chosen this motto for his books has never been clear to me, but probably it has some biographical significance." I venture to suggest that the meaning of the motto must be sought in the mediæval symbolism by which Rachel represented the contemplative life and Leah the active. This symbolism was used by Dante in a famous passage of the *Purgatorio*.

Sappia, qualunque il mio nome domanda,
Ch'io mi son Lia, e vo movendo intorno
Le belle mani a farmi una ghirlanda.
Per piacermi allo specchio qui m'adorno;
Ma mia suora Rachel mai non si smaga
Dal suo miraglio, e siede tutto giorno.

Ell'è de' suoi begli occhi veder vaga,
 Com'io dell' adornarmi con le mani;
 Lei lo vedere, e me l'oprare appaga.

(*Purg.* xxvii, 100-108.)

The metaphor goes as far back as Gregory the Great (*Moral.* vi. 37; *Hom. in Ezek.* ii. 2). By adopting such a motto Donne implied that his own desire was for a life of study and contemplation, though circumstances had forced on him a life of action.

EVELYN M. SIMPSON.

The Bondman: An Antient Storie. By PHILIP MASSINGER.

Edited from the First Quarto with Introduction and Notes by BENJAMIN TOWNLEY SPENCER. Princeton University Press for the University of Cincinnati; London: Humphrey Milford. 1932. Pp. viii+266.¹ 17s. net.

FOR this admirable edition of Massinger's first definitely dated play Dr. Spencer has collated seven copies of the First Quarto (1624), which was freely corrected at the press, and taking as his starting-point the most corrected state of the text in each forme has incorporated Massinger's autograph corrections as printed by Dr. Greg. It is not clear why he refers to these (p. 71 and elsewhere) as "supposedly autograph" since (p. 72) he has "accepted Dr. Greg's pronouncement [of their authenticity] as authoritative." Where the resulting text is still impossible he has, very sparingly, adopted the conjectural emendations of the Second Quarto (1638) and of the modern editions. Apart from purely typographical matters,² I have noticed only a few trivial literal errors in the text: I, ii, 12, *obserued* for *obserud*; II, i, 45, *well* for *will*; III, iii, 89, *seceure* for *secure*; V, ii, 89, *publicke* for *publike*.

The Introduction deals briefly but sufficiently with the date of composition, editions, and stage history, and proceeds to discuss at greater length the Sources (divided into the Classics and Contemporary Events), Classical Ideas, and Dr. Spencer's Final

¹ The text of the play is reprinted page for page from the First Quarto on the numbered rectos of pp. 76-159, with textual notes on the unnumbered versos opposite.

² Diphthongs are commonly (as in the word SCÆNA in all scene headings) represented by separate letters; and in many cases where the original printer acknowledged the limitations of his fount by using a short *s* instead of a long *i* in combinations for which he had no ligatures (for example before *b*, *k*, or an apostrophe) Dr. Spencer's printers, who have no long-*s* ligatures at all, have wantonly introduced the long form of the letter.

Estimate of the play. Dr. Spencer sets forth more fully and clearly than previous critics Massinger's indebtedness to Plutarch's life of Timoleon, and parades the authors, from Herodotus to Giles Fletcher, from whom the story of rebel slaves quelled by their masters' whips might have been derived. He also tries to establish borrowings from books XXXIV and XXXVI of Diodorus Siculus, recounting the Servile Wars of Sicily, but here, though there is no reason why Massinger should not have known Diodorus, the parallels are not very close.

Dr. Spencer's most interesting contribution to the appreciation of the play is his very full exposition, in two sections of his introduction and throughout his notes, of the contemporary political situation with Massinger's comments on it, and of the doctrines of classical Stoicism which went far to mould Massinger's thought. In this respect he wisely eschews intransigent source-hunting, but quotes freely from Cicero and Seneca to show with telling effect how constantly their ideas were in Massinger's mind in his treatment of slavery, in his distinction of active and passive virtues, in Leosthenes' question, "Doe you call, / What was his dutie, merit?" (IV, iii, 158-9), and at countless other points.

In *The Bond-man* Massinger turned from his earlier tragedies of lust and revenge¹ to tell in lighter vein a happy love story of constancy rewarded and jealousy shamed, setting the weak suspicions of Leosthenes against the loyal faith of Pisander. This is the artistic core of the play, and Dr. Spencer, fresh from the study of Massinger's political and philosophical creeds, perhaps takes it rather too seriously when he suggests as an alternative title *The Bond-man*; or, *The Triumph of Duplicity*. Cleora's transfer of her affections—if, indeed, she ever felt anything more for Leosthenes than a disinterested esteem strengthened by dutifulness to her father—is not brought about by Pisander's wiles but by Leosthenes' repeated revelations of his jealous and suspicious nature. Nor is her change a sudden one: her uneasiness is early aroused, is progressively heightened, and is brought to a head by her wooer's ingratitude and brutality at a moment when she has just been pleading with him for generosity. If we regard the play as a play first and a document second, Pisander's "eloquent expression of Stoic doctrines and ideas" in which Dr. Spencer sees his "chief

¹ [Earlier on the generally accepted dating, but this is upset by Dr. R. S. Telfer's recent proposal to date *The Unnaturall Combat* as late as 1626.]

claim to glory" is surely no more than a means to Massinger's chief end of portraying the Perfect Lover.

Apart from this slightly exaggerated philosophical bias, and from a dislike of obscenity which I cannot convince myself that I share, Dr. Spencer's appraisal seems to me just and clear-cut, and it forms a worthy conclusion to a thoughtful and lucid introduction.

I append a few notes on particular points :

- I, iii, 83, As to the supream Magistrate] The note invents difficulties ; the meaning is simply " to Timoleon as chief magistrate."
- II, i, 41, well breath'd] Surely the usual sense of " sound-winded " is required ; that is the reputation of which a Massingerian court gallant would be covetous. And what about " at length " ?
- II, ii, 119, to taste your lipps not safe] Gifford's modernisation " lip's " is not " contrary to idiom inasmuch as it makes the noun singular." The singular is usual ; cf. *Beleue as you List* (Malone Soc.) IV, i, 1826-8 : " your viper wine . . . but vappa to the nectar of her lippe."
- II, iii, 23, And yet defie the Whip] I do not understand Dr. Spencer's difficulty, unless he has failed to see that " defie the Whip " means " not be whipped."
- IV, iii, 117, all Scepters the worlds Empire bow to] Dr. Spencer makes no comment on the grammar and does not record the emendation " bows " introduced in the adaptation of 1719 and accepted by all the editors. I should prefer to retain " bow " and read " Empires."
- V, i, 68-9, Distrust from others springs. . . . From diffidence in our selues] Dr. Spencer's defence of the quarto reading is ingenious but strained, and we should accept the emendation " of others." This was made by Coxeter, not by Gifford ; and " other " for " others " is a misprint in Gifford's second edition absent from his first.
- V, iii, 155, I long haue mask'd disguis'd] Gifford's alteration of " mask'd " to " march'd " evoked an early protest in *The British Critic* for April, 1806, which observed in a review of his edition that

Perhaps, however, the reading of the old copies is right. For, to *mask* in *disguise*, though apparently tautology, is an expression that

belongs to our elder poetry. Thus Spenser, *Faer. Qu. B. 2. C. 3. st. 52*, where Britomart and her nurse resolve to go in disguise :

"Now this, now that, twixt them they did devise,
And diverse plots did frame to *mask* in strange disguise :"

for such is the true reading of the passage.¹

(*The British Critic*, 1st series, xxvii. 360.)

This is of some interest, since the anonymous critic has evidently realised—as later writers (myself included) have failed to do—what it was that made Gifford feel the need of any alteration.

A. K. McILWRAITH.

The Scandal and Credulities of John Aubrey. Edited by JOHN COLLIER. London : Peter Davies. 1931. Pp. xxxviii + 169. 8s. 6d. net.

SINCE cutting for length rather than for breadth became fashionable, it has been increasingly possible to convert some of our older writers into saleable books. Whether Aubrey gains as much from this process as Mr. Collier somewhat forcefully asserts is arguable. Nevertheless, he has put together, from the *Brief Lives*, a pleasant and readable book. He has, quite properly, made personal taste the basis of his selection, and has simply omitted whatever he finds "not delightful." A certain flamboyancy makes his introduction lively reading, though the present reviewer, after pursuing Mr. Collier's theme to the end, still feels that it is a pity for real appreciation like this to sacrifice simplicity of statement for the sake of effect and epigram. I am still wrestling with the opening statement that John Aubrey, "whose name is now famous," is yet unknown. In the limited circle where his name is famous he is assuredly not unknown.

M. ST. C. B.

The Matchless Orinda. By PHILIP W. SOUERS. Harvard Studies in English V. Harvard University Press ; London : Humphrey Milford. 1931. Pp. viii + 326. 15s. net.

APART from one brief chapter (viii, *The Poet Orinda*) this book is biographical and traces the full story of Katherine Philip's personal and literary contacts. Her conception of friendship was lofty but

¹ It is the true reading, but the true reference is Book III, canto iii, stanza 51.

her notions of scansion frequently lamentable. The book is excellently produced, but it is, if so unfeminine a description may pass, a chronicle of small beer. It would require a much stronger infusion of ingredients such as malice, irony, humour, drama—ingredients which the author must supply for himself since the subject was for the most part happily without them—to make interesting so detailed a life-story of a minor poetess. The meat of these researches condensed into an Introduction accompanying a complete edition of Letters and Poems would seem to be the natural limits of a modern study of the once matchless Orinda.

G. D. WILLCOCK.

Poetry in France and England. By JEAN STEWART. Hogarth Lectures on Literature, No. 15. London: Hogarth Press. 1931. Pp. 156. Price 3s. 6d. net.

THIS is a readable essay upon movements in English and French poetry from the Renaissance to the close of the nineteenth century. By introducing it as "an essay in criticism of a hybrid and unorthodox variety, 'mélange adultère de tout,'" Miss Stewart disarms her critic, forestalling objections to the scrappiness and over-compression of a study that confines so much material within so short a space. She has wisely abstained from comment upon mutual influences, restricting herself to the treatment of the two literatures in parallel. The freshest and most useful sections of her essay are those devoted to the poetry of France, which she treats at greater length as being the less familiar to English readers. In so brief a study an imposing array of authorities is neither possible nor desirable; but references in the footnotes should have included page numbers as well as titles.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

The Romantic Movement in Germany. By L. A. WILLOUGHBY. Oxford University Press. 1930. Pp. viii.+192. 6s. net.

Studies in the Age of Goethe. By MARSHALL MONTGOMERY. Oxford University Press. 1931. Pp. viii.+121. 7s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR WILLOUGHBY has followed up his book, *The Classical Age of German Literature*, with an equally valuable volume on the subsequent age of Romanticism, which is particularly welcome in that he has accepted those new German methods of interpretation which

have seemed to him to throw additional light on his subject, and has avoided those which obscure a poverty of insight in sesquipedalian phrases. He begins with a definition, or rather with an historical and critical exposition, of the distinction between "Classic" and "Romantic," for Romantic literature is not of the same order in all countries, and a single label is insufficient. The Romantic School in France owed much to the classical Schiller, and it was both he and Goethe, and not the German Romanticists, who influenced the English Romantic poets. German Romanticism should make a peculiar appeal to the English student, since its origins can be traced to a considerable extent to English writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In fact, when some of the forerunners of German Romanticism, such as Klopstock's *Messias*, Goethe's *Werther*, and Bürger's *Lenore*, appeared in English garb and added their quota to English literary history, they were paying the debt, sometimes with interest, that Germany owed to Milton, Richardson, and Bishop Percy. Professor Willoughby summarises, in his chapter on "Weltliteratur," German influences from the last quarter of the eighteenth century to the age of Rossetti and William Morris, and his concluding remarks on music and the arts emphasise the strength of the link between German Romanticism and the pre-Raphaelites.

The recent death of Mr. Marshall Montgomery, Reader in German in the University of Oxford, has left a serious gap in the small band of authoritative writers on German literature in this country, and the five essays which he had just time to see through the press were published posthumously. The hand of the philologist has lain heavily upon the study of German literature, and Mr. Montgomery contributed by his work to the renaissance which is slowly taking place in the modern language departments of our Universities. His habit of interlarding his writings with innumerable German words and phrases between quotation marks makes it appear, however, as though his subject had not been fully digested, and tends to obscure the value of his opinions and conclusions, besides making him difficult to read for the student who has not a perfect knowledge of German. The longest of the papers in this volume is entitled "Goethe's *Faust* as a Whole," and the freshness of the treatment will both interest the layman and stimulate the specialist. In breaking a lance with anonymous and insufficiently informed critics of a leading English review he condemns the pedantry which applies to a work such as *Faust* the standards of Greece, and incidentally

touches upon the distinction between Classicism and Romanticism, which appears clear-cut only to the superficial mind. He insists that *Faust*, which was sixty years in the making, is a unified work of art, "written in many moods about one vast theme," and his contention is supported by a multitude of modern critics. The truth is, perhaps, that *Faust* is too many-sided, that it has too many roots and too many branches for its philosophy and its significance as a work of art to be summed up in one all-embracing formula. Its beauty is inexhaustible and it is the embodiment of Goethe's profoundest thought, but any attempt to produce both parts on the stage must ultimately fail, for the theatre can only give them the appearance of unity by excision and mutilation. The nearest approach to a solution of the problem of dramatic production may eventually be provided by the sound-film.

The remaining four papers deal with the earliest English versions of the first part of *Faust* and of Goethe's Autobiography, the themes of fate and guilt in the German drama, and the poetry of Hölderlin.

WILLIAM ROSE.

Christina Rossetti : A Study. By FREDEGOND SHOVE. Cambridge University Press. 1931. Pp. xvi+120. 5s.

SINCE Christina Rossetti's death in 1894 six biographical or critical studies have been devoted to her. Two of these appeared in the now remote 'nineties, three in 1930, the centenary year of her birth, and now Mrs. Fredegond Shove's *Study* comes to complete the sextet.

It has been suggested that the rare counterpoise of passion and austerity in Christina's best work appeals more strongly to the masculine than to the feminine reader. Be this as it may, five out of her six English biographers are women, and another admirer of her own sex may be found in Madame Félix-Faure Goyau, whose appreciation in *Vers la Joie* has received from English critics less attention than it deserves.

Strictly speaking, only Mr. Mackenzie Bell's and Miss Mary F. Sanders' books can be classed as "biographies." The monograph in the "English Men of Letters" series and Miss Edith Birkhead's admirable little volume, both published last December, keep biography sternly subordinate to critical analysis, and Mrs. Fredegond Shove has struck between the two components a balance even more unequal, conceding only 35 out of 120 pages to a summary of

Christina's uneventful but not undistressful earthly pilgrimage. In the non-biographical sections of any work planned on these lines the reader will look hopefully for something fresh, suggestive, stimulating in the way of interpretation or commentary, though it is, of course, no easy matter to say anything new about a poet like Christina Rossetti, whose genius became static so early and whose thoughts moved within frontiers so confined. The task has been too formidable for Mrs. Shove, who brings to it so much more ardour than judgment, and whose artless enthusiasm, coupled with an occasional triteness and looseness of diction, gives to many of her pages the form and colour of a school essay.

This lady ascribes to Christina several qualities which earlier biographers have overlooked, humour, exuberance and buoyancy among them. The figure emerging from this book bears little resemblance to William Michael Rossetti's portrait of his sister, and still less to the immortal Kit-Kat of Edmund Gosse. To say this is not to say that the new delineation is out of drawing. Of that every student of the Rossetti chronicles must judge for himself. Nor would it be just to rebuke Mrs. Shove for her neglect of *A Ballad of Boding, Sleep at Sea, Amor Mundi, Later Life*, and the incomparable rondels in *Some Feasts and Fasts*. She writes of what she likes and understands best, and she disclaims any intention of presenting a complete survey. The purist will feel more inclined to utter a word of mild protest against the confusion of rhyme with metre, the punctuation of phrases as if they were sentences, the use of "glimpse" as a verb, the introduction of such locutions as "marrow-dissolving" and "in about 1860." It is also a little difficult to understand how a soul could become unmoored from its trammels, how anything could be dry and molten at one and the same time, and why Christina or any one else should have felt any special veneration for the innocence of—among other creatures—caterpillars.

Some temerity is demanded of the critic who attempts to probe the heart of Christina Rossetti unaided by the small amount of Italian necessary to the enjoyment of the *Rosseggiar dell' Oriente* cycle. Mrs. Shove is disarmingly frank about her limitations in this respect; but she would have been wiser to avoid the language of "our lively neighbour the Gaul," if she is under the impression that *recueillement* bears any analogy to the English word *recoil* (p. 83).

We remain her debtors, however, for the "marrow-dissolving" vision on p. 93, where cows are seen coming at Miss Rossetti's

bidding and then departing to make room for the snowflake "at her nod." The cows are not alone; birds, blossoms, bees, flowers and streams come and depart with them. And one has a horrid suspicion that Christina Rossetti herself was capable of reading such a paragraph as this without even the flicker of a smile.

D. M. S.

SHORT NOTICES

Creative Poetry : A Study of its Organic Principles. By B. ROLAND LEWIS. Stanford: the University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 1931. Pp. xii+399. 23s. net.

"This is the final test of poetry, that it communicate a mood," Whether the mood is worth communicating or not apparently does not matter. The mingled pretentiousness and naiveté of this book might be excused if in it Professor Lewis had done anything towards providing us with a new set of critical weapons, less fallible than the old: but since, for all his "laboratory methods" and for all his width of reading—the quotations range from the *Carmen Arvale* and the chants of the Navajo Indians to *In Memoriam*—Professor Lewis is still not preserved from describing as "poetic art of a high order" such verses as—

"The hours I spent with thee, dear heart,
Are as a string of pearls to me.
I count them over, every one apart
Each bead my rosary"

there remains no possible motive for making one's way through this "heterogeneous congeries of unamalgamating matter."

E. E. PHARE.

The Later Genesis (Englische Textbibliothek 15 : New Edition, with Supplement). Ed. FR. KLAEBER. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1931. Pp. 12+69. M2.

In this book Professor Klaeber brings together in a conveniently small space extracts from Old English and Old Saxon texts relating to the Fall of Man, namely: Genesis A and B, the Old Saxon Genesis, the Heliand, Christ and Satan, Guthlac, Phoenix, Christ and Juliana. A bibliography, notes, and a glossary complete this very useful little book.

M. C. D.

The Devil Take Her : A Study of the Rebellious Lover in English Poetry. By LOUIS B. SALOMON. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. London: H. Milford. 1931. Pp. vi+359. 16s. 6d.

"The purpose of the present study is to trace the progress of amorous insubordination through English poetry." Whether the study was dictated by Mr. Salomon's fancy or was made to fulfil some academical requirement is not stated. At any rate he has pursued his task with a zest which will communicate itself to his readers, though they will not take too seriously Mr. Salomon's subdivisions of the poetry of revolt against feminine tyranny—"Farewells to Love," "Personal Revolts," "Equal Rights," "Against Women in General," etc. It is enough that under these headings English poetry has been ransacked and has yielded a large collection of generally light-hearted extracts. Whether the book is entitled to be called "a work of scholarship" (p. 153) we may leave an open question, it is at least a delightful introduction to one side of English love-poetry.

G. C. M. S.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

- ANGLIA, Vol. LVI. (Neue Folge XLIV.), September 1932—
Studien zur schriftsprachlichen Entwicklung der neuenglischen
Velarvokale in Verbindung mit *r* (H. M. Flasdieck), pp. 113-264.
Continued October, pp. 321-420.
Einige Wulfstexte und ihre Quellen (Karl Jost), pp. 265-315.
Further note, October, p. 448.
Beowulf (Edward Schröder), pp. 316-17.
Origin of the name.
A Note to Lines 18-20, Act II, Sc. i, of *As You Like It* (Grace P. Smith),
pp. 318-20.
Parallel in Bernard of Clairvaux.
- October ————
Eine kleine Nachlese zum *Beowulf* (Fr. Klaeber), pp. 421-31.
A "Viking Legend" in England (A. H. Krappe), pp. 432-35.
The witch episode in the *Gesta Herewardi*.
Notes on *Beowulf* (Kemp Malone), pp. 436-37.
Ecgwela, l. 1710.
Ae. *isig* (W. Krogmann), pp. 438-39.
Das Lebensgefühl in modernen englischen Roman (I. Marinoff),
pp. 440-48.
- CORNHILL MAGAZINE, September 1932—
Friends of Sir Walter: Unpublished Letters (W. Forbes Gray),
pp. 257-65.
The Making of the "Minstrelsy": Scott and Shortreed in Liddesdale
(W. E. Wilson), pp. 266-83.
John Gibson Lockhart (M. Clive Hildyard), pp. 371-82.
- DIALECT NOTES, Vol. VI., Part 3, 1931—
An American Glossary, Part I, A—Dip (R. H. Thornton), pp. 100-216.
Continued (Dipping—Frog-pond), Vol. VI., Part 4, July 1932, pp. 239-80.
- ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XIV., August 1932—
Sir Walter Scott: What He Means to Scotland (J. A. Falconer),
pp. 145-54.
The Frumtings of *Widsith* (K. Malone), pp. 154-58.
A division of the Suevi: references in Isidore and Hydatius.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 121

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XIV., October—

The Background of Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* (J. L. Cardozo), pp. 177-86.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Vol. 162 (New Series 62), September 1932—

Lord Byron *versus* Francis Merryweather (Hans Hecht), pp. 49-52.

Die religiösen Dramen George Moores (Hellmut Bock), pp. 53-60.

Anti-Englisches in der irlandischen Literatur (Gösta Langenfelt), pp. 61-77.

Die Halle Heorot als Schlafsaal (Edmund Weber), pp. 114-16.

Garulf, Guðlafs Sohn, im Finnsburg-Fragment (Fr. Klæber), pp. 116-17.

Wie ist ne. great [e] entstanden? (C. A. Reinhold), pp. 117-18.

Zur Quelle des Othello und zu Shakespeares Kenntnis des Italienischen (Werner Wokatsch), pp. 118-19.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXI., July 1932—

Science and Language in England of the Mid-Seventeenth Century (Richard Jones), pp. 315-31.

The influence of science on prose style.

Mrs. Radcliffe on the Supernatural in Poetry (Alan D. McKillop), pp. 352-59.

Conversation intended for the introduction to *Gaston de Blondville*.

Gower's Vocabulary (Theodore P. Kaplan), pp. 395-402.

Proportion of foreign elements.

LEEDS STUDIES IN ENGLISH AND KINDRED LANGUAGES, Number 1, 1932—

Outline of a Theory of Language (Alan S. C. Ross), pp. 1-14.

A System of Transliteration for Old English Runic Inscriptions (Bruce Dickins), pp. 15-19.

The "Epa" Coins (Bruce Dickins), pp. 20-21.

Evidence for ascription to Eorpwald.

A New Collation of the Vespasian Psalter and Hymns (Ruby Roberts), pp. 22-23.

A Note on the Authorship of the Katherine Group (R. M. Wilson), pp. 24-27.

Collation of the Text of the English Lyrics of MS. Harley 2253 (G. L. Brook), pp. 28-30.

The Etymology of "Saracen" (Walter Taylor), pp. 31-35.

List of Theses in Leeds University Library, p. 55.

LIBRARY, Vol. XIII., September 1932—

Bibliography—An Apologia (W. W. Greg), pp. 113-43.

King Richard II's Books (Edith Rickert), pp. 144-47.

List found in a Memoranda Roll.

The Personal Prayer-Book of John, Duke of Bedford (Eustace F. Bosanquet), pp. 148-54.

Wayland's Edition of *The Mirror for Magistrates* (W. A. Jackson), pp. 155-57.

Evidence of the unique title-page and Note to the Reader in the Dyce copy.

Subscription Publishers prior to Jacob Tonson (Sarah L. C. Clapp), pp. 158-83.

A Publishing Agreement of the Late Seventeenth Century (R. B. McKerrow), pp. 184-87.

Henry More's *Opera Theologica*.

A Bibliographical Paradox (W. W. Greg), pp. 188-91.

Scribal errors and dialectal variations in MS. Cotton Nero A.x.

Milton Autographs Established (Hugh C. H. Candy), pp. 192-200.

Autograph corrections in printed copies of *Lycidas*.

The Booksellers and Printers of Richmond, Surrey (A. Cecil Piper), pp. 201-07.

LONDON MERCURY, Vol. XXVI., September 1932—

A Century-old Friendship (Mary B. Whiting), pp. 434-45.

Unpublished letters from Mrs. Barbauld.

MEDIUM ÆVUM, Vol. 1, September 1932—

The English tail-rhyme romances (A. McI. Trownce), pp. 87-108.

A defence against the common critical depreciation.

Notes on the text and interpretation of *Pearl* (E. V. Gordon and C. T. Onions), pp. 126-36.

Old English *scaegan* (N. R. Ker), pp. 137-38.

The scribes of the *Trinity Homilies* (N. R. Ker), pp. 138-40.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLVII., November 1932—

The First Gothic Revival and the Return to Nature (A. O. Lovejoy), pp. 419-46.

Sir Joshua Reynolds on the Picturesque (W. D. Templeman), pp. 446-48.

His criticism of Gilpin's *Essays*.

Swift's Belief in Immortality (F. M. Darnall), pp. 448-51.

Notes on the Yahoos (C. M. Webster), pp. 451-54.

A Checklist of the Poems of Charles Sackville, Sixth Earl of Dorset and Middlesex (Helen A. Bagley), pp. 454-61.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXVII., October 1932—

The Commonplace Book of Arthur Capell (G. Tillotson), pp. 381-91.
Variants in Donne's poems.

The Mystery of *The Stage Coach* (W. J. Lawrence), pp. 392-97.
Stage history.

Emendations of the *Beowulf* Text (W. J. Sedgefield), pp. 448-51.

Notes on Some Words in the "Lindisfarne Gospels" (A. S. C. Ross),
pp. 451-53.

The Continuity of Alliterative Tradition (W. W. Greg), pp. 453-54.

Matthew Prior's *Alma* (W. P. Barrett), pp. 454-58.

Prior's debt to Montaigne.

Two Letters from Mary Shelley to Gabriele Rossetti (E. R. P.
Vincent), pp. 459-61.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXX., August 1932—

The Newberry Collection of Arthuriana (William A. Nitze), pp. 1-4.

Malory and the *Perlesvaus* (Robert H. Wilson), pp. 13-22.

The Chapel Perilous episode.

The Date of Peele's *Old Wives' Tale* (Thorleif Larsen), pp. 23-28.

Evidence for 1593-1594.

A Prompt Copy of *A Looking Glass for London and England* (C. R.
Baskervill), pp. 29-51.

Copy of an unrecorded edition with MS. additions.

The Suppressed Poems of Burns (J. Delancey Ferguson), pp. 53-60.

Unreliability of *The Merry Muses*.

Ilium, the Palace of Priam (A. A. Hill), pp. 94-96.

Benoît's use of the name.

A Note on Gascoigne's Biography (John E. Hankins), pp. 96-97.

Gascoigne's marriage and *Dan Bartholmew of Bathe*.

Pope's Self-Plagiarism (W. K. Chandler), pp. 98-100.

Repetition of similes.

Robert Southey and the *Edinburgh Review* (E. L. Griggs), pp. 100-03.

Letter to Coleridge in December 1807.

Scott's Experiences in Haunted Chambers (Coleman O. Parsons),
pp. 103-05.

His account of a night in Dunvegan Castle.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Vol. 18, October 1932—

Sentimental Comedy in the eighteenth century, I (F. T. Wood),
pp. 37-44.

Sheridan's *Rivals* and Ben Jonson's *Every Man in his Humour* (P. Fijn
van Draat), pp. 44-50.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 163, August 6, 1932—

Keats in America: "Leaf-fringed" (T. O. Mabbott), p. 97.

Use of epithet in 1821. Replies by L. R. M. Strachan, August 20, p. 141;
by T. O. Mabbott, October 1, p. 249.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 163, August 13—

English Provincial Theatres, XVIII Century (M. H. Dodds), p. 115.

List of Cunningham's prologues and epilogues for various theatres.

William Cobbett (Nelson F. Adkins), p. 116.

Contemporary American account. Further note, October 8, p. 258.

— August 20—

Benjamin Harris, the first American journalist (J. G. Muddiman), pp. 129-33.

Bookseller, printer and publisher in England and America. Continued August 27, pp. 147-50; September 3, pp. 166-70; September 24, p. 223; October 15, pp. 273-74.

Milton's Asclepiadean Verses (T. O. Mabbott), p. 170.

Reconsideration of readings. Replies by V. R., p. 209; by S. Gaselee, October 1, p. 249.

Rochester's "Remains" and an old Manuscript (Brice Harris), pp. 170-71.

Authenticity of poems in an old commonplace book.

— September 10—

Milton: a marginal note on Varchi (T. O. Mabbott), p. 189.

— September 17—

Milton's *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso* (C. W. Brodribb), p. 201.

Suggested by the "Declaration of Sports"?

Shakespeare and the Rival Poet (Archibald Stalker), pp. 201-05.

Suggested "disintegration" of the Sonnets. Continued September 24, pp. 221-23, and October 1, pp. 236-40, 252.

— October 15—

Jane Austen (H. F. P. and M.), p. 285.

Suggested identification of Barton Park.

— October 29—

Notes on *The Taming of a Shrew* (H. W. Crundell), pp. 309-10.

Parallels with Peele and Du Bartas.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. XLVII., June 1932—

Science and Folk-Lore in *The Owl and The Nightingale* (Henry B. Hinckley), pp. 303-14.

The Irish Framework of *Gawain and The Green Knight* (Alice Buchanan), pp. 315-38.

Costume in the Middle-English Metrical Romances (Harvey Eagleson), pp. 339-45.

The Authorship of the *Pearl* (C. O. Chapman), pp. 346-53.

The claim of John de Erghome, of York.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 125

The Date of the A-Text of *Piers Ploughman* (Oscar Cargill), pp. 354-62.
Argument in favour of 1376.

Piers Plowman and the *Roman de Fauvel* (Roberta D. Cornelius),
pp. 363-67.

Who is *Piers Plowman*? (Howard W. Troyer), pp. 368-84.
The significance of *Piers* in the poem.

The Mediæval-Modern Conflict in Chaucer's Poetry (Agnes K.
Getty), pp. 385-402.

Notes on Chaucer and the Rhetoricians (Marie P. Hamilton),
pp. 403-09.

Chaucer's Eagle and the Rhetorical Colors (Florence E. Teager),
pp. 410-18.

Echoes of the Anathema in Chaucer (James A. Work), pp. 419-30.

Chaucer's Source MSS. for the *Clerkes Tale* (J. Burke Severs),
pp. 431-52.

The *Clerk's Tale* as a Possible Source for *Pandosto* (Thomas H.
McNeal), pp. 453-60.

Kirk's Life Records of Thomas Chaucer (Albert C. Baugh),
pp. 461-515.

Lydgate's Influence on the Aureate Terms of the Scottish Chaucerians
(Pierrepoint H. Nichols), pp. 516-22.

Sir Thomas More's Connection with the Roper Family (Pearl Hogrefe),
pp. 523-33.

Animal Simile in *Paradise Lost* (James Whaler), pp. 534-53.

The *Charliad*, an Unpublished Mock-Epic by Joseph Spence (Austin
Wright), pp. 554-58.

The Moral of *The Ancient Mariner* (Newton P. Stallknecht), pp. 559-69.

Shelley Works out the Rhythm of *A Lament* (Bennett Weaver),
pp. 570-76.

Jottings in Shelley's Note Books.

Harmony of the Senses in English, German and French Romanticism
(Erika von Erhardt-Siebold), pp. 577-92.

— September —

Music in the Craft Cycles (Fletcher Collins, Jr.), pp. 613-21.

Gilbert Pilkington Once More (Mendal G. Frampton), pp. 622-35.

Arguments against his authorship of the *Turnament of Totenham* and the
Secunda Pastorum.

Representations of Lyndsay's *Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* (Anna J.
Mill), pp. 636-51.

Greene's *James IV* and Contemporary Allusions to Scotland (Ruth
Hudson), pp. 652-67.

A satire on James VI?

- Another Source for *The Trial of Chivalry* (Frederic L. Jones), pp. 668-70.
Greene's Cards of Fancie.
- Othello*, Quarto 1, Reconsidered (K. W. Cameron), pp. 671-83.
- Natural Supernaturalism in *The Tempest* (Nelson S. Bushnell), pp. 684-98.
- The Tempest* (E. E. Stoll), pp. 699-726.
- An Experiment with Massinger's Verse (Frederic L. Jones), pp. 727-40.
 Lines ending in *of* or *to* as test of authorship.
- The MS. Play, *Anna Bullen* (Edythe N. Backus), pp. 741-52.
 Date, and relation to Banks' *Vertue Betray'd*.
- Thomas Bancroft (William Charvat), pp. 753-58.
 Additional biographical details.
- The Triple-Portrait of John Lacy (Charles W. Cooper), pp. 759-65.
 History of the portrait and identification of rôles.
- The Occasion of MacFlecknoe (D. M. McKeithan), pp. 766-71.
- A Prologue and an Epilogue for Nicholas Rowe's *Tamerlane* by Richard Steele (Rae Blanchard), pp. 772-76.
- The First Printer of *Tristram Shandy* (Lewis P. Curtis), pp. 777-89.
 Ann Ward of York.
- Catherine the Great and Shakespeare (E. J. Simmons), pp. 790-806.
 Her adaptations and their influence.
- Lessing's Relation to Early English Sentimental Comedy (P. P. Kies), pp. 807-26.
- Plotting in Reade's Novels (E. G. Sutcliffe), pp. 834-63.
- The Period Dictionaries (C. C. Fries and W. A. Craigie), pp. 890-97.
 Scope and methods.
- Shakespeare, Hayward, and Essex Again (Ray Heffner), pp. 898-99.
 Reply by Evelyn M. Albright, pp. 899-901.
- "A South Sea of Discovery" (A. Kelcy), pp. 901-02.
As You Like It, III, ii, 207.
- Malvolio's "Please one, and please all" (E. P. Kuhl), pp. 903-04.
Twelfth Night, III, iv, 25.
- "Something browner than Judas's" (M. C. Linthicum), pp. 905-07.
As You Like It, III, iv, 30.
- A Note on the Madmen's Scene in Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* (S. Ichiyé Hayakawa), pp. 907-09.
- A Note on *The Gypsies Metamorphosed* (S. A. Tannenbaum), pp. 909-10.
 Errors of transcription in Dr. Cole's edition of the Huntington MS.
- REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAIN, Vol. IX., August 1932—
- L'offrande d'un traducteur: Notes sur l'anglais de John Florio, traducteur de Montaigne. II (A. Koszul), pp. 508-24.
- La Religion dans l'œuvre de Dryden avant 1682. II (P. Legouis), pp. 525-36.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 127

REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAIN, Vol. X., October—

L'amour et le mariage chez Godwin (M. S. Storr), pp. 31-45.

Sur le texte de la Tempête (F. C. Danchin), pp. 46-48.

Further evidence of abridgement?

Sur un vers de Donne (P. Legouis), pp. 49-50.

"Hesper" and "Vesper" in the *Second Anniversary*, l. 198.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXIX., October 1932—

The Form of Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* (Dorothy Bethurum), pp. 515-33.

Sidney's Political Ideas (W. D. Briggs), pp. 534-42.

The Relation of *Richard III* to *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York* and *The Third Part of Henry VI* (Clayton A. Greer), pp. 543-50.

Richard III a continuation of 3 *Henry VI* rather than of *The True Tragedy*.

The History of the First English Newspaper (Matthias A. Shaaber), pp. 551-87.

The quarto newsbooks started by Bourne and Archer.

The Influence of Godwin on Wordsworth's Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff (Charles W. Roberts), pp. 588-606.

The Spenserian and Miltonic Influence in Wordsworth's *Ode and Rainbow* (Abbie F. Potts), pp. 607-16.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, August 4, 1932—

The First Publication of Two Poems by Keats (Bertha M. Stearns), p. 557.

In the *New York Ladies' Magazine*, August 1837. Further note, September 8, p. 624.

The Musk-Rose as a Wild Flower (Vernon Rendall), p. 557.

Growth of the tradition from Shakespeare to Keats. Replies by Katherine M. Buck, August 11, p. 569, and August 18, p. 581.

Boswell's Shorthand (W. R. Batty), p. 557.

The Lay of the Last Minstrel (T. Erskine Swanzey), p. 557.

Variant in the Fourth Canto. Reply by R. F. Johnston, August 11, p. 569.

— August 11—

The Text of Pepys (Edwin Chappell), p. 569.

Errors of transcription in Wheatley's edition. Note by F. McD. C. Turner, August 18, p. 581; by W. Matthews, August 25, p. 593.

A Life of Burns (Davidson Cook and L. M. Watt), p. 569.

Correction of details. Further note by L. M. Watt, October 20, pp. 761-62.

— August 18—

John Gower, pp. 573-74.

The Donne Canon (George Williamson), p. 581.

MS. notes in a copy of the 1639 edition of the *Poems*.

Milton's *Epitaphium Damonis* (Leicester Bradner), p. 561.

Separate edition of 1639-40? Note by T. O. Mabbott, October 27, p. 790.

Unrecorded Editions of Robert Boyle, p. 584.

Further note by G. Keynes, August 25, p. 596.

Scott First Editions (Davidson Cook), p. 584.

Bibliographical errors. Notes by R. S. Rait, September 1, p. 607, and James Curle, September 29, p. 696.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, August 25—

John Locke, pp. 585-86.

Crashaw and St. Theresa (Austin Warren), p. 593.

Evidence of Crashaw's knowledge of her works in 1638.

Elizabethan Stage Conditions (William Poel), p. 593.

Spectators on the stage.

Tennyson's *Holy Grail* (E. A. Osborne), p. 596.

Unrecorded printed proof.

September 1—

Tristram, Lancelot and Courteous Love, pp. 597-98.

Scott in San Francisco (F. W. Heron), p. 607.

Letter to J. Train in 1816.

September 15—

Waverley Revisited, pp. 629-30.

Scott, Shelley and Crabbe (H. J. C. Grierson), p. 643.

Letters to and from Scott.

Whitehall in the Seventeenth Century (E. Jeffries Davis), p. 643.

Errors in the topography of Miss Boswell's *Restoration Court Stage*.

Jeremy Taylor (R. Gathorne-Hardy), p. 648.

Additions to bibliography.

September 22—

A Letter of Crabbe to Scott (Geoffrey Bullough), p. 666.

From Trowbridge, June 1815. Note by C. C. J. Webb, September 29, p. 691.

September 29—

Five Minor Poets (L. Birkett Marshall), p. 687.

Little-known Seventeenth-century writers—Latham, Watkyns, Willan, Cudmore and Prujean.

Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound* and Plato's *Statesman* (E. M. W. Tillyard), p. 691.

Reply by George Sampson, October 20, p. 762.

Scott's Letters : A Correction (H. J. C. Grierson), p. 691.

The report of Constable's possible failure.

Locke's Shorthand Diaries (W. Matthews), p. 691.

Byron Bibliography (John Carter), p. 696.

English Bards and Scotch Reviewers : spurious editions.

7, and

er 29,

Villan,

Till-